DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 718　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　HE 008 780

AUTHOR	Engdahl, Lilla E., Ed.; Shay, Thomas M., Ed.
TITLE	Extended Degree Programs in the West: Conference Proceedings.
INSTITUTION	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Nov 76
NOTE	118p.; Papers presented at the Conference on Extended Degree Programs, University of California, Berkeley (July 11-14, 1976)
AVAILABLE FROM	Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, P.O. Drawer P, Boulder, Colorado 80302
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *Adult Education; *Conference Reports; Continuing Education Centers; Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; *External Degree Programs; Government Role; Higher Education; Post Secondary Education; *Regional Planning; State Government; *University Extension
IDENTIFIERS	*Access (Education); Extended Degree Programs

ABSTRACT

The WICHE project on Extended Degree Programs aimed to contribute to the development of sound and successful extended degree programs as one segment of postsecondary education for adults. The conference had several basic goals: (1) to foster communication among persons involved in such programs throughout the region; (2) to propose varied solutions to operating problems; (3) to identify further service opportunities for such programs; (4) to consider the present and future of such programs; and (5) to identify future service roles that could be undertaken by WICHE or other western organizations. The proceedings presented in this report are edited texts of oral presentations. They include the following topics: redefining higher education; the big issues and challenges; analysis of selected programs operating in varied settings; discovering and meeting needs in serving people; state responsibility in extended degree programs; financing external degree programs; the role of extended degree programs in continuing education; and achieving and maintaining high quality of teaching services and student performance. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136718

EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAMS IN THE WEST

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PAPERS PRESENTED AT THE
CONFERENCE ON EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAMS
JULY 11 – 14, 1976
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

HE008788

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAMS IN THE WEST:

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Papers Presented at the Conference on Extended Degree Programs
July 11-14, 1976
University of California, Berkeley

Co-sponsored by

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
and
The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Edited by

Lilla E. Engdahl
Thomas M. Shay

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
P.O. Drawer P, Boulder, Colorado 80302
An Equal Opportunity Employer

November 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction v

Session Topics:

Redefining Higher Education 1

The Big Issues, The Big Challenges 11

On the Firing Line--Analysis of Selected Programs Operating in Varied Settings 15

Serving People: Discovering Needs, Meeting Needs 41

State Responsibility in Extended Degree Programs 45

Financing Extended Degree Programs 59

Extended Degree Programs--Part of a Larger Picture of Continuing Education 77

The Quality Question--Achieving and Maintaining High Quality of Teaching Services and Student Performance 91

A Summary of the Full Group Discussion and Recommendations on Extended Degree Programs in the West 107

Extended Degree Programs in the West Conference Program 109

Conference Roster 113

Publications Related to Extended Degree Programs 121

Introduction

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) is pleased to publish the proceedings of the Conference on Extended Degree Programs in the West, which was held at the University of California, Berkeley, July 11-14, 1976. These proceedings (that comprise the Conference's program) are edited texts of the oral presentations. All of the presentations made at each session are grouped together under that session title. The report for each session includes a synopsis of the session, a brief statement identifying each presenter, and the papers presented at that session.

The purpose of the WICHE project on Extended Degree Programs was to contribute to the development of sound and successful extended degree programs as one segment of postsecondary education for adults. It was with this purpose in mind that the conference was planned.

The conference had several basic goals:

1. To foster acquaintance and communication among persons involved in extended degree programs throughout the 13 western states
2. To propose varied solutions to major problems that have been identified by persons responsible for the operation of extended degree programs
3. To identify further service opportunities for extended degree programs and to suggest ways of making use of these opportunities
4. To consider the present and the future of extended degree programs in the whole context of postsecondary education
5. To identify future service roles that could be undertaken by WICHE or by other organizations or groups in the West

The success of any conference depends on the quality of the papers presented and the quality of participants who discuss them. In both respects we were indeed fortunate. We wish to acknowledge the contribution of the presenters who generously gave of their time in preparing their presentations. We also wish to acknowledge the contribution of the session leaders who actively provided leadership for each session and of the conference participants who attended and participated.

The second element of the project on extended degree programs was the Extended Degree Programs Survey in the West. The results of the survey were published in July. Copies of this report were distributed to all conference participants. The report was mailed to all institutions in the West and to state offices of higher education.

It is our hope that the report of the survey and the Conference on Extended Degree Programs in the West have provided useful information and stimulation for continuing study and improvement of this important service of postsecondary education.

Thomas M. Shay
Conference Director

Redefining Higher Education

Alex C. Sherriffs

Dr. Sherriffs provided a base for the conference in his discussion of recent, current, and possible future needs; the demands for "different" or "nontraditional" higher education; and the responses to those needs and demands. He raised broad as well as specific questions to stimulate the entire conference group to think of extended degree programs as one aspect of the very wide range of higher education services.

Alex C. Sherriffs
Vice-Chancellor, Academic Affairs
California State University and Colleges

Alex Sherriffs was appointed vice-chancellor, Academic Affairs, the California State University and Colleges, in September 1973. He has served as education advisor to Governor Ronald Reagan; prior to that, he held administrative and teaching positions at the University of California, Berkeley.

"Redefining" higher education is a useful and even necessary task, particularly during times of societal pressures for changing our purposes and functions. When outside pressures, political and social, combine with an internal lack of consensus, we face an identity crisis sufficient to require careful diagnosis and both short-term and long-term provision for therapy. I suspect that many of us believe that this is where we are today.

Public primary and secondary education have been more subject than we have been to political pressures and controls. Can we learn from that arena what may be in store for us? In recent years, society has managed to overwhelm public education, kindergarten through grade 12, by requiring that it carry out many socially significant, often noneducative, functions for which very few educators have been trained. Further, when society's agents, whether legislative, executive, or administrative, choose public education for the locus of yet another social improvement they are always in a hurry, and largely they oversimplify the implications of what they do. Thus, they fail to provide time or expertise so that educators can prepare for implementation. I refer to such mandated functions as nutrition, health, the resolution of drug problems, the prevention and control of venereal disease, and the working out of society's difficulties in regard to race relations. Schools are where the children are--hence the co-option. Many of the social challenges the schools have been given are, of course, worthy challenges.

It is not clear how well the public schools have been able to meet the new responsibilities given them. It is clear, however, that many high school graduates cannot read or write at a level that prepares them for college achievement. One need not strain to find cause and effect relationships. Parenthetically, however, I am not overlooking the probable influence of television on reading and writing; the new responsibilities given the schools do not operate in isolation.

Across the country, many in government are also working on new ideas about higher education. Again, their goals are often worthy, but there is seldom recognition of or concern for the effects on the institutions themselves. The university is given little lead time for response; in fact, it is fortunate if it is made a party to the discussion at all. Typically, a proposed regulation or law that may vastly change fundamental characteristics of the institution, or its independence, is simply announced--with a few days to prepare ourselves, if we are lucky, for a hearing.

All of us have our own value-laden ideas of the essence of a university. It is this essence that is being warped, for better or for worse, by outside pressures, and--let us not be naive--also by inside ideologues and political beings. I am one of those who believe that a true university is itself of more value than are all of the new charges that can be imposed on it combined. The university, after all, has been the one institution that our society has determined should seek the truth wherever it may lead and be free to share that truth, as objectively as mortals are able, with each succeeding generation. The university is truly at the cutting edge of civilization's forward thrust. It is the repository of human knowledge about humans, about the ways they have found to live together, about their ideas, history, dreams, failures, successes, knowledge about the world around them, and about the interaction between themselves and that environment. It is the place to stimulate and to develop curiosity, to learn how to seek evidence, to find means for evaluating evidence, and to aid in learning to live with probabilities in a world where almost nothing can be certain. It is the place of all places where one should expect to find the highest valuing of respect for those with whom one may differ. There are others who believe much as I do. They may be more articulate or they may have different points of emphasis. But any definition of a university describes a precious and remarkable institution that humans have developed, and which those in power almost surprisingly have allowed to develop.

It is remarkable that this institution has survived so long with its primary purposes intact. I suggest that the very idealism involved in those purposes has captured something of the best in most of us, whether we function on or off the campus. To be sure, there are many who have tried to bend the university to their own purposes. Authoritarians of the right and left are always hopeful; in many countries they have in fact succeeded in making what was a university merely a voice for dogma. In this country, most often the threats come by way of a less immediately frightening, but in the long run more dangerous, manner: misuses of our institutions by immature, shallow thinking, self-serving individuals who are content with their own peculiar tunnel vision of the future--and who themselves live within the protection of the university. Over the past two centuries, those who would distort the American university externally or internally occasionally have been successful to some degree. But thus far the essential characteristics of the institution have proved strongly enough ingrained, and their protectors have been sufficiently resilient, for the university to withstand the threats aimed against it.

We in the universities and colleges have been slow to make certain constructive responses on our own initiative that might logically take account of changes in the age, life circumstances, and level of motivation of those who come to us as students, that would capitalize on useful technological developments, and that would recognize some of the realities of societal change. In some of our institutions, the quality of teaching has slipped. Also, in some, the true meaning of academic freedom is understood by too few. Yet, we must, at any cost, avoid the pitfalls of succumbing to changes, whether through imposition or seduction would distort the essence of our institutions and could well remove at last our reasons for existence. For example, there are those today who would have our four-year institutions justify their existence only by the success of their placement services in finding employment for graduates.

I believe it true that our graduates are better prepared to do well in whatever career they choose because of the knowledge and potential flexibility they bring as a result of a general education combined with knowing some area of human interest in depth. However, should we ever become stampeded into seeing our primary role as preparation for specific occupations for our students, then we will soon be in direct competition with trade schools, which can do that job less expensively and more quickly. We can only suffer by comparison, as we let down society by not succeeding in a role we never should have undertaken.

As a corollary, I know personally that some of us have already felt pressures to accept students for specific career areas only to the extent that there are jobs waiting for them. Our programs to prepare teachers is one such case. We must fight these pressures, for a society that today tells us what occupations we may not aspire to will tomorrow tell us which ones we must prepare ourselves to accept. In no way can that be justified within a democracy. Insofar as resources permit, we should support our students in their desires to explore areas in which they have interests and ability. We should, however, guarantee a broadening experience as well as a specialty. And we should provide information to students on predictions about opportunities for employment in various fields. By doing these things, I believe we will have made the best effort both for society and for the individual.

We should be wary lest we get caught up in the current "thing to do." "The thing to do" these days is change. Descriptors associated with change include flexible, imaginative, vigorous, and innovative; those associated with not changing include rigid, doctrinaire, authoritarian, and elitist. These associations are to point out whether the issue is the future of the lecture method of teaching or an effort to hold to standards on student performance. For some it has become change for its own sake. However, to paraphrase Edmund Burke, to innovate is not necessarily to reform.

We also should be deeply concerned about our need to inspire and to educate the public about what an institution of higher education is. With all of its diverse forms, there is still an essence that the public needs to hear about if it is to respect it. Historically, the public almost learned to revere higher education. Until only a few years ago, education could have what it wanted for the asking--dollars, academic freedom, and tenure. One of the highest accolades was to leave money to a university, to receive an honorary degree from a university, or to have a building named in one's honor at a university. Before we can regain the public's full respect, however, it is necessary for us to know what we believe ourselves. For without self-respect, we are poor teachers.

There is a side effect and salutary aspect to this process of contemplating where we are and how we can improve. To illustrate: some of us are involved in programs that allow for faculty to compete for funds with which to explore innovative ways of approaching the teaching process. From such programs there have developed some good ideas, especially in regard to today's technology and changing student mix. But, to me, at least as important is that contemplation of innovative programs has led many faculty, administrators, and students to think about teaching as a process rather than treat it as habit or a fact. An increased interest and awareness develops, and with that an increased vitality. I am sure that even when nothing novel is added, the teaching by those involved in thinking about teaching improves.

Recently I found myself fascinated by the excitement of discovery by some colleagues who were looking into what is called self-paced learning. Many aspects of self-paced learning that evoked comment were a process I experienced during my freshman year at Stanford, in 1935. We should remember that thinking about the teaching process is just as useful when it involves rediscovery as when it is truly invention. Alden Dunham has noted an analogous value derived from discussing the idea of the time-shortened (3-year) degree:

> If you say the degree should take three years rather than four, you automatically are forced to ask yourself what ought to be the content of the degree. Quite frankly, most of us in higher education have not stopped to ask that question very often. So I am perhaps a bit amused by the furor that the talk about the three-year degree has caused, because for the first time many faculty members are really beginning to look hard at what the content of the degree program ought to be.

I realize the emphasis of this conference is on extended degrees. Where does that phenomenon fit into the definition, or the redefinition, of higher education? Traditionally in higher education, a group of scholars resides near and works in classroom and office buildings. Usually central in location to these buildings is the heart of the university--its library. Laboratories, which are absolutely essential for a number of disciplines, are available. And student support services are useful, if not vital, to the progress of many 18- to 25-year-olds, freshman students through graduate-level students; these, too, will be nearby.

Thus, it is not surprising that the campus boundaries, plus perhaps the living groups just outside those boundaries, have long been, for most academicians and for most purposes, the limits of the university. It has been easy to see where gown met town! All this seems clear. However, equally obvious today is the growing interest in utilizing the public university to provide higher education to a much-extended population of potential students, and in ways and locations much more varied than before. Using data from the California State University and Colleges, which provides a sample of 311,000 students, we find that typical on-campus students are 26 years old, most take less than a full load of 11.4 units, 73 percent are employed at least part time, and 36 percent are or have been married. Not like it used to be! Things are even more different if we look at those students enrolled in the external degree programs. These are upper division and graduate students. Their mean age is 33 years, and 28.7 percent are over 40. Ninety-three percent are employed, 82 percent full time and 11 percent part time. Eighty-five percent are married and more than 95 percent are working for degrees, 59 percent of them for a master's.

The traditional American educational experience has been a residence one: the student has usually spent four years at a campus, following a pattern of courses leading to a degree. Most of the students served by the traditional American university have been youths--18 to 25 years of age--who take time out only for institutional vacation periods.

A "college education" has long been believed to involve more than the formal course work. The intangible college residence experience of being immersed in an intellectual atmosphere, with bull sessions, cultural programs, and the like, has been accepted as being of high intellectual and social value. There have been successful efforts to bring academic stimulation into the residence halls by having courses taught there, populating some units with students carrying the same majors, or assigning faculty fellows to units in combinations that should provide a variety of interests. The English university model adopted early in our history set the stage for this.

Traditionally, students have had several motivations for seeking higher education: the intangible benefits of living a fuller and more useful life because of what one learns and experiences, social mobility or maintenance of social positions, and preparation for professional careers. There have been many other individual motives, as well: following a loved one to campus, one's duty to parents who were themselves loyal to a given institution, postponing work, avoiding war, or even participating in the nation's largest dating bureau. The changes that have occurred in the age, working status, and marital condition of students matriculating on U.S. campuses have, to a significant extent, encountered adjustments on the campus that have had no apparent impact on the basic integrity of the institution itself. Accepting part-time students and being more flexible in the time allowed to achieve a degree are examples. Part-time students have had an effect on campus life that is perhaps a wash--between pluses and minuses. On the negative side, there is clearly a reduction in the sense of community for all students, with increasing numbers of commuters who spend very few hours on the campus.

Population density is increased, with the anonymity problems that that brings. On the positive side, the presence of older, working, and married students does provide for a more heterogeneous and presumably more stimulating campus experience. The part-time student has little to lose, for such students have stimulating experiences in their own lives and at work. For them the campus is not the whole of living in any event. Providing opportunities for part-time students has been coupled with providing greater scheduling flexibility--night classes and weekend classes are increasingly common.

Can one go further to meet the needs of those desiring additional education but who are unable to commute to a campus from their place of residence or work? Obviously, yes. The real question is, can one do so without endangering the integrity of the university by the changes one makes? Or, in the long run, will the definition of a university be changed in the eyes of the public, who will then, because of new expectations, cause the institution to undergo fundamental change? I believe it is possible to extend the university while maintaining quality, provided proper care is exercised. To effect this, some will argue to have the state set up an external degree agency and operate it as a new and unique institution with a separate mission. This might protect the ongoing university somewhat from association with any possible lapses of quality. But it would also require another governing board, another costly administration, much duplication of faculty, at least some capital costs, and, most important, building its own quality control system from the ground up before it could establish its credibility with individual students and with the public.

A different approach, one many of us are in some stages of developing, and one I favor, would be to extend the present campus or system of campuses. Speaking from the perspective of California public higher education, the argument runs:

1. The state has a multibillion-dollar investment in its existing public segments: buildings, libraries, faculties, and administrators recruited from throughout the nation.

2. Two-year community colleges are conveniently located throughout the state (a total of 103). Many are already operating extensive programs in response to the need for lower division education off their campuses.

3. The need for upper division and graduate-level education in off-campus locations can be met by existing colleges and universities at a lower cost than could be equaled by any new agency for higher education.

4. It is anticipated that the need for off-campus education will grow, while there will be, according to demographers (because of the birth dearth), a decline in the need for some on-campus educational programs. Existing institutions can redeploy their resources as demands shift.

5. Programs delivered off campus by existing institutions would be designed and administered as well as taught by faculty who are now responsible for on-campus programs of proven value.

6. Experience gained through the operation of off-campus programs would accrue to the existing institutions and would facilitate institutional self-renewal.

If present institutions are to carry out extended educational responsibilities, certain conditions must be met. In the face of low-quality external offerings to the public from a host of entrepreneurs, and with increasing concern for the quality of some higher education programs, both the integrity of higher education and the welfare of the participating public must be protected by insisting that any program carried out in the name of a regular university be held to standards at least as rigorous as are held for that university's on-campus offerings. Admissions standards should be equivalent, and program offerings should reflect existing campus strengths, avoiding even the most tempting entrepreneurial opportunities if these are not consistent with campus capacities. Programs should have the appropriate academic sponsorship, management, monitoring, and evaluation, and they should utilize heavily regular campus faculty as instructors. Great care should be taken not to offer programs that have instructional resource requirements that cannot reasonably be taken off the campus. Courses requiring laboratories or equipment that is difficult to move are cases in point. A degree should not result simply from the accumulation of units without consideration of the logic of the discipline and provision for general education. These requirements should be at least as solid as for an on-campus degree.

With strictures such as these, one might well hope for a rewarding adventure. Under these conditions, faculty who teach both external and on-campus courses would become better for the experience. The off-campus, more highly motivated, generally more demanding, and usually more mature student can reawaken or intensify an interest in teaching and in finding ways to obtain higher student achievement, leading to a more realistic realization of what students can produce if only they are asked!

There will be many headaches involved. Ask any who work with institutions heavily committed to extended degree programs. The maintenance of comparability of on-campus and off-campus instruction is not easy. And there continues to exist second-class status for continuing education in the eyes of the general faculty, even by some of those who themselves, in order to make a dollar, teach in off-campus programs. It is a "pecking order" phenomenon that has a historical explanation. Association with extension courses for nonmatriculated students and the frequent lack of Ph.D.'s for those assigned continuing education responsibilities have made for the difference. It is, however, asking much to expect equal standards from those who themselves are not accorded equal status.

Also, it is difficult to know exactly how many potential students there are. As higher education has learned in the past, accurate manpower predictions of any kind are rare. A given level of demand today can change tomorrow. Further, student interest areas may change dramatically--just recall the ups and downs of engineering, the sudden decrease in commitment to ecology, and the current upsurge in human services. Then, too, the logistics involved in finding where consumers are and in locating facilities near them in which to provide courses takes time, talent, and staff.

For those who work within systems of higher education, problems will develop about the limits of the service area for each campus--territorial prerogatives. For nonsystem campuses and private institutions, I suspect the rules of free enterprise are in operation--unless the state steps in. When is an institution in the backyard of another is one question. Yet more sticky, what are the rules to be when campus A ignores an off-campus need, and campus B is ready and desires to go there? Finally, for public institutions, when should state support be provided? When should programs be self-supported (presuming there is a choice!)? Whatever the answer, it should be an equitable one.

In summary, there are developing public demands as new segments of our population find a need for, and now believe it appropriate to pursue, further postsecondary education. If we in higher education choose not to meet these needs, there are others who will try. It is probable that they will do so in the name of higher education; it is all too possible that they will do it poorly and that higher education generally will be the loser in reputation and public support. It is also probable that, if a vacuum exists, the government will step in and either force higher education to provide services or set up new agencies to take over aspects of higher education's responsibility. Once involved, government will not likely let us do the job as we see best--their rules will be in statute form and will satisfy the needs of some lobbyist or perhaps a reform-minded public servant. Government will continue to give a finite number of dollars to higher education; a new agency will simply take some of those dollars. Most serious of all, the government will have intervened once again, and next time it will be even easier for it to do so. We should decide what is right; we should make our move. Taking the initiative, we are in a much better position to resist changes that could endanger the essence of our institutions, and changes that could in the long run confuse the public on whom we depend about what a university is.

The principles included in decisions about extended degree programs are the same as those that should be involved in a number of other areas of discourse: other kinds of off-campus activities, time-shortened degrees, credit by examination, credit for experience, cooperative education, self-paced learning, and all other kinds of innovations or rediscoveries. During these days when the word "relevance" in education has come to have a set of cheap associations in the minds of the users--often related to painless entertainment on the way to making a buck, or receiving without giving--we should do some careful thinking about relevance. How do we once again get the public and its representatives to understand how relevant a university is in a free society, how relevant to the progress of civilization the university is, in both teaching and scholarship, and how relevant a liberal education is for living a full and comprehending life?

This is the time when equality of educational opportunity is finally being realized. Financial and remedial support are still necessary for many and will be into the foreseeable future. It is an odd moment for some of our colleagues in the academy and in our legislatures to decide that equality of opportunity in education is not enough. Equality of achievement and a stifling homogenization with no one different from anyone else seem to be the goals of some. Martin Trow refers to these egalitarians as "reformer-expansionists."

They have had influence. At a number of institutions, when an enrollment ceiling is reached there are pressures, sometimes successful, to determine who gets in by only the toss of a coin. Achievement, aptitude, and motivation beyond minimum levels are ruled out. Of what integrity is the promise we make to our children--study hard, read great books, take difficult courses: all will help you secure entrance to the campus of your choice? Their call for open admissions would work, perhaps, if we were allowed to provide remedial programs for those who need to catch up and honors programs for the gifted. But no, that would smack of elitism. Instead they would force the faculty to teach to the level of least readiness, least ability, and lowest motivation.

Can we pretend to be surprised by grade inflation? How can a humane teacher grade the full spectrum of academic readiness on a single scale? Serious students are beginning to protest and some are leaving our campuses. Ideology or no ideology, human beings still need a reward system in this less-than-perfect world. And they need to have meaningful grades, meter readings, and feedback from their efforts to help them know when they are correct, when in error, when doing well, and when they are just getting by. There is abundant research evidence to show that students respond well to reward, and even to punishment. Where they fall down is when they are ignored. Giving B grades to everyone ends up a meaningless response by the instructor. The individual student is truly ignored--and feels it. There is a related emotional assault on testing generally--even as tests become even better than they used to be.

In the final analysis, all this becomes destructive of individuals, of an institution (the university), and eventually of a democratic way of life. And it is packaged as being humane! Sly reference is made to minority students. I personally concur with those minority leaders who have been pointing out that the approach of the "reformer-expansionists" is basically racist. Such egalitarianism assumes that ethnic youth cannot meet standards even with remedial assistance. What a terrible belief! Yes, this is a time for reflection and redefinition. There are directions we must avoid; there are efforts we must expend, and there are cul-de-sacs that we have entered.

The Big Issues, The Big Challenges

Leland Medsker, Stewart Edelstein, Janet Ruyle, and John Shea

Leland Medsker
Director
Nontraditional Education Project
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education

Stewart Edelstein
Postgraduate Research Assistant
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education

Janet Ruyle
Assistant Director
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education

John Shea
Senior Fellow
Carnegie Policy Council on Higher
Education

The first Monday morning session, which dealt with problems and issues pertaining to extended degree programs, was the responsibility of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education staff members who had conducted case studies of such programs in 16 institutions or systems in the United States. Leland Medsker opened the panel discussion with a review of the policy-oriented study. Its published report presented a tentative set of guidelines for initiating and implementing extended degree programs. He reported that these guidelines were later reviewed at a high-level policy seminar attended by some 60 educational and political leaders and that the guidelines as revised would soon be published separately.

Following Medsker's overview of the project, other members of the staff reported selected findings from the study and used the information to highlight many crucial issues pertaining to extended education at the postsecondary level. Stewart Edelstein and Janet Ruyle displayed graphic information on the students in extended degree programs and called attention to the implications of student characteristics to program and student services. Edelstein also delineated some of the problems and issues arising in connection with the staffing and organization of such programs. John Shea discussed a number of issues relating to the financing of extended degree programs, from the standpoint of both students and the institutions.

Because the Center panel drew so heavily from reports already or soon to be published, a verbatim report of the session is not included in the Proceedings. Readers and others interested can obtain the following two reports from the sources as indicated.

Medsker, L., Edelstein, S., Kreplin, H., Ruyle, J., Shea, J. Extending Opportunities for a College Degree: Practices, Problems, and Potentials. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, Berkeley, 1975.

Medsker, L., and Edelstein, S. Policymaking Guidelines for Extended Degree Programs: A Revision. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, forthcoming.

The group distributed the following list of issues and policy questions that they identified in the study and that are addressed in the guidelines document.

CLIENTELE: Specific Considerations with Respect to Clientele When Mounting an Extended Degree Program

What factors should be considered regarding clientele to be served by extended degree programs?

What strategies should be used in the promotion of extended degree programs and in the recruitment of students?

PROGRAM FEATURES AND STUDENT SERVICES THAT EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAMS SHOULD OFFER

What kinds of programs should be offered in the extended degree format and how should they be delivered?

How may extended degree programs most effectively identify, develop, coordinate, and utilize learning resources alternatives?

Should the admissions requirements and the process for extended degree programs be similar to those of traditional programs?

What factors should be considered in providing orientation and counseling services for students in extended degree programs?

What procedures and criteria should be used in assessing learning and in granting credit or advanced placement?

STAFFING: How to Recruit, Utilize, and Compensate Staff in Extended Degree Programs

How can regular faculty from an existing institution be most effectively recruited and utilized?

How can faculty in individualized study programs be most effective?

How should staff be compensated in extended degree programs?

What are the best ways to recruit and make use of outside resource persons (adjuncts)?

How can the role of faculty and external degree programs be related to faculty governance and/or collective bargaining?

ORGANIZATION: How Extended Degree Programs Should Be Organized

What factors should be considered when decisions are made regarding the organization of extended degree programs?

How should extended degree programs be organized in individual institutions?

How should extended degree programs be organized and administered in multicampus systems of higher education?

PLANNING, INITIATION, AND EVALUATION: How an Institution, System, or State Agency Should Proceed with Planning, Initiating, and Evaluating an Extended Degree Program

In anticipation of formal planning activities, what factors should be considered before embarking on the development of an extended degree program?

To what extent should program goals be delineated in the planning process?

Should an extended degree program be approved for an indefinite period or for a designated trial period?

Who should be involved in the initial planning and development process?

What review procedures and criteria should be used at the institutional level for approval of new extended degree programs?

On what basis and in what ways should extended degree programs be evaluated?

FINANCE: How Extended Degree Programs and Students Should Be Funded

What criteria should be used in deciding how extended degree programs should be financed?

What changes in existing student financial aid programs are needed to ensure the equitable treatment of students in extended degree programs?

In adapting content, delivery systems, and support services to the needs of adults, how should start-up and program development activities be financed?

Should extended degree programs be budgeted in the same way as traditional on-campus programs?

EXTRAINSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES: The Role of Government Agencies, Regional Associations, and Accrediting Authorities in the Development of Extended Degree Programs

What responsibilities do state agencies such as coordinating boards, departments of budget and finance, planning boards, and legislatures have for the planning, implementing, and coordinating of extended degree programs?

What responsibilities do federal agencies have in the development of extended degree programs?

What responsibilities do regional and professional accrediting bodies have in the development of extended degree programs?

What responsibilities do regional higher education associations have in the development of extended degree programs?

On the Firing Line--Analysis of Selected Programs Operating in Varied Settings

Barry G. Schuler, Donald Clague, Donald M. Schliesman, Barbara H. Mickey, and George McCabe

The presenters for this session represented different types of institutions. Each listed and analyzed major problems or policy issues involved in extended degree programs and described how programs were financed, organized, and administered at his or her institution. The speakers described the kinds of curricula offered, the settings in which the programs are offered, the staffing arrangements, and the types of students attracted to the programs.

Barry G. Schuler
President
North Idaho College

Barry Schuler has served as president of North Idaho College, which serves the five northern counties in Idaho, since 1968. He has actively sought the extension of educational opportunities to persons in outlying communities.

I. Extended Degree Program Setting:

North Idaho College is a public community college situated in a city of 18,000, with a mission to serve one relatively populated county and four rural counties in Idaho's panhandle.

NIC has a day enrollment of more than 1,400 students and offers a comprehensive program, including academic transfer, general education, paraprofessional, and vocational-technical curricula.

Three smaller cities located 30 to 80 miles from the central campus have been chosen as sites for satellite campuses.

II. Goals of the North Idaho Extended Degree Program:

By law, North Idaho College is the comprehensive community college designated to serve the entire five-county area of northern Idaho.

The initial objective was to offer persons in outlying communities the opportunity to begin work toward an academic degree without the burden of considerable driving or time away from family responsibilities and without having to pay the higher costs of commuting or obtaining dormitory housing.

Eventually, special interest courses and courses for personal growth and edification were added in response to expressed interests.

III. Issues Encountered in Setting Up the Extended Degree Program:

The first issue was the sources for financing the program. The NIC tax district encompasses only Kootenai County. The other four counties were authorized to pay a subsidy from liquor refunds, and state aid was provided for regular academic programs.

The second concern was for the academic integrity or quality of the courses to be offered.

- How were qualified instructors to be located, scrutinized, approved, and subsequently evaluated?
- How could adequate library resources and supplementary reading materials be made available to students in the remote centers?
- How could sufficient time in the classroom and for faculty-student consultation be arranged? How especially could laboratory sciences be offered off campus?
- How could student admissions and records be handled for these part-time nontraditional students?
- How could the students be adequately provided with academic advising services?
- What minimum number of resident credits should be required to be completed on the main campus?

The potential effects of the satellite campuses on the central campus became the third point of concern.

- Would extended degree opportunities decrease the workload and eventually the employment security for the regular full-time instructors?
- Would a tendency to enroll at the extension centers reduce the revenue available for the dormitory, student union, and associated student body activities on the main campus?
- If full-time instructors were recruited to teach in the distant centers on an overload, extra pay basis, would they become fatigued and less effective in their regular teaching assignments?

A further issue that gradually surfaced was who should be served? What courses should be offered? If local funds were to be contributed, should not the courses be practical or job oriented rather than offered for enjoyment, intellectual curiosity, or general edification?

Another issue was the relationship of the community college program to the statewide extension services of the state university.

A final issue was how communications between a distant campus and the local constituents could be effectively handled to take into account local preferences and local needs.

IV. Operational Characteristics of the NIC Program:

Organization

- A half-time director of extended degree programs administers the total on-campus and satellite extension program from the central campus in Coeur d'Alene.
- A local coordinator who resides in the host community is appointed on a part-time basis for each satellite campus.
- The director works closely with the extension program director at the University of Idaho to avoid duplication of effort. Essentially, all lower division and special interest courses are the responsibility of North Idaho College, while all upper division and graduate-level courses, plus certain special interest courses outside the capabilities of NIC, are offered by the University of Idaho.

Financing

- Course costs are covered by a combination of student tuition, state aid, and a local county subsidy paid from state liquor dispensary refunds.
- A minimum enrollment of 12 has been established to ensure coverage of costs.

Staffing

- Satellite coordinators are local residents with sincere interest in the program who are generally well known in the community and have ample and flexible time to commit to the assignment.
- Instructors are recruited from four sources: (1) regular full-time instructors who go out from the main campus for extra pay, (2) local high school teachers who are qualified at the master's-degree level and who enjoy the challenge of college-level teaching, (3) local business and professional people who are willing to teach in the special areas of their expertise to meet a specific need, and (4) highly qualified academicians who have moved to the region as part of a complete change of their personal and occupational life style.
- Instructors must be unanimously approved by the appropriate division chairperson, the dean of instruction, and the director of extended day and adult continuing education prior to appointment. If any one of the three withholds approval of a candidate, that member assumes a special responsibility for finding an alternate to fill the need.

Facilities

- Classrooms are obtained in the local public school buildings either as a donation or on a rental basis, depending on the community.

- Library resources are made available through the local public library.

Courses Offered

- Standard academic transfer courses leading to the Associate in Arts degree.
- Only geology and general physical science are available for the laboratory science requirement.
- Special interest courses such as tailoring, fly tying, gun care and maintenance, and survival techniques are offered.
- Occupational sequences in law enforcement, banking, and business have been offered in response to local requests.
- Vocational-technical short courses have been offered by special arrangement for local businesses, industries, and Indian programs.

Quality Control

- The local coordinator assists in gathering student evaluations of courses and instructors.
- Instructors are allocated $50 per class per semester for purchase of books and audio-visual materials to be placed in the local public library for student use. All such items are then donated to the local library.
- The local libraries are prepared to arrange for interlibrary loans to accommodate any additional needs.
- In some instances, students are required to commute to Coeur d'Alene for one session for library orientation.
- Scheduling of laboratory sciences in two weekly sessions, with the lecture to be offered in the hometown and the laboratory to be offered on the main campus, is under consideration.

Profile of Students Served

- The extension courses serve a broad spectrum of people, from advanced high school students to senior citizens.
- Varies by campus: (1) the Coeur d'Alene evening program is heavily utilized by day students to fill out a full-time program in the face of schedule conflicts, filled class sections, or job schedules, (2) Sandpoint has an emphasis on students who enroll for cultural enrichment and personal edification, (3) in Bonners Ferry, the predominant interest is in learning skills for practical living--such as sewing and home economics, and (4) in

Shoshone County (a mining district), the emphasis is on improving job skills in areas such as accounting, business, and law enforcement (inducements are offered by area employers).

- In all cases there is a tendency for mature women to begin as part-time evening students and then eventually move to full-time status on the main campus to complete an associate degree program.
- Students at satellite campuses are primarily adults who have been out of high school for a number of years.

Communications

- The local coordinator is the key to assessing interests and needs in the community and to informing potential students of scheduled course offerings.
- The local coordinator takes information to key groups, becomes recognized as the contact person for current information, and helps arrange local publicity.
- The cooperating public library has turned out to be a vital link in providing information about courses and offerings to likely student enrollees.
- The college public relations officer arranges for periodic news stories about the satellite programs in the local media.
- The community is surveyed prior to each semester regarding preferences for courses to be offered.
- Participating faculty members and full-time instructors on the main campus are surveyed each semester regarding interest in teaching at an extension center and any suggestions for courses that might be offered.

Results

- Faculty acceptance has been excellent, and participation has been generally enthusiastic.
- Student interest has remained relatively constant for the past three years.
- Financing has been adequate, and the cooperating levels of government have continued to approve and support the program.
- A significant number of students have entered the higher education "pipeline" who would not have otherwise continued their education.
- North Idaho College has gained recognition and public support throughout its service area.

Donald Clague
Vice-President--Academic Affairs
La Verne College

As vice-president of Graduate and Professional Studies at La Verne College and, prior to that, as vice-president of Academic Affairs, Donald Clague has been extensively involved in the development of off-campus programs. Currently, he serves as a consultant in Program Planning and Budgeting Systems, Accountability, Teacher Education, Title I and III programs, and other areas.

During the first 85 years of La Verne College's existence, 50 percent of its bachelor degree graduates entered the teaching profession. Now this pattern is altering. When California required a fifth year of study for teacher credentialing, graduate study (obviously in relation to teacher preparation) was initiated at La Verne. During the 1960s both of these educational enterprises grew rapidly.

At about the same time, in-service training for teachers became a means of completing requirements for the fifth year, of advancing on the salary scale, and of securing other credentials for additional fields of educational employment. Such educational in-service training required college and university sponsorship so the student could earn credits acceptable for these purposes. Our alumni, friends, and soon many others turned to us to assist them in developing educational programs to meet their needs. Such requests and--as we viewed it--opportunities caused us to examine our institutional philosophy and objectives. Statements like "Not all that is valuable to be learned has to be taught," and "La Verne College is not just a place, it is people in pursuit of learning" became a part of our basic philosophy. So we designed a mission statement around three major questions: Is there a need for educational services? Can we fill that need with a program of quality? and, If we fill that need, will it be of value to La Verne College? "Value," as reviewed in the last question, was broadly interpreted to include such things as public relations, future students, and financial support. Thus, we moved in two directions in developing off-campus programs leading to degrees.

1. The first was in the direction of graduate degrees in education for teachers--the same degrees we offered and still do on campus, master's degrees in education. Lately we have moved in the same way to offer off-campus graduate degrees in the field of management.

Our procedure has been to respond to requests for or to promote interest in our in-service training programs, to provide those programs utilizing our regular staff, or to arrange with others on a contract basis for provision of those services requested. Frequently, the first in-service program was followed by requests for additional programs. When such programs were well received and the numbers of participants great enough, degree programs were initiated, and we established our Professional Development Centers (PDCs). These centers might exist long enough to move one group of students through a degree program and then close down, or they may continue for years. Often they are in a public school, are staffed with a center coordinator and counselor, relate to a counselor on campus, and are composed of students with a common degree purpose such as a Master of Education degree in teaching reading, early childhood education, or other areas.

Other staffing for the Professional Development Centers might be from regular campus faculty or part-time faculty employed from the general area of the center. Faculty are screened and selected as though they were to be regular campus faculty. In addition, at the main campus we have counselors assigned to each center, we handle PDC admissions just as for all campus admissions, and we actually operate more extensive quality control than we attempt at present at the main campus.

2. The second way in which we have moved in external degree programs has been to offer programs on military bases. These centers are much more permanent than PDCs; they are termed Residence Centers. For us they are primarily for undergraduates, although gradually we have extended graduate degree programs to them. There is a permanent, full-time staff at these Residence Centers, with strong ties to the home campus, developing learning resources centers, and careful monitoring of programs and processes. In essence they really have become branch campuses.

A main concern with off-campus programs is what we now call "quality assurance." This is our effort to assure that external programs are what they should be, and to protect the student as consumer and the wider public as the employer, certifier, or purchaser of the student services. We attempt to perform this through (1) faculty selection procedures requiring the same assurances as for regular campus teaching personnel; (2) requiring course proposals that are reviewed by and meet the approval of regular campus personnel teaching in that area; (3) monitoring of courses in progress; (4) mid- and post-course student evaluations of courses; (5) use of an external educational audit; (6) comprehensive exams developed and used both on and off campus and administered and graded by regular campus staff; (7) professional papers in the area of speciality and written to thesis standards; and (8) regular Academic Council review and approval of any degree program before any part of it goes off campus. I know of few, if any, regular campus programs that undergo the rigorous review that is constantly applied to the external degree programs we now offer.

A major question is the interface of external degree programs with campus programs and personnel. We have attempted to separate management of facilities, scheduling, and general operations from campus faculty who retain faculty control of academic programs. Although some institutions are moving toward complete separation of external and regular programs, our direction is now toward greater interface and involvement of faculty in on- and off-campus programs. To some extent this is a result of a basic philosophic change in administration and to some extent a result of accreditation recommendations. We are pleased with the direction at this time.

Other interesting questions include the increasing competition from other colleges and universities for the external degree "market," which often results in "bargains" for students in terms of low cost and/or low requirements in time and effort for a degree. Then there is the question of contracting for educational services with nonuniversity agencies. There are many of these; some are excellent. In fact, we use some to deliver special services, but only after visiting their programs in action and requiring that all our quality control issues are met. These educational services provide only limited and carefully described functions, leaving us in control of the academic quality of the program. Certainly there is a problem in being in the forefront with a new type of educational activity. One is subject to making mistakes that result in public relations problems and criticism by educational peers, who sometimes follow into the same activities with self-righteous attitudes. Being one of the first in an activity naturally requires creativity and more investment in evaluation and research.

A major concern in external programs is for providing the necessary resources for adequate learning experiences. I refer to libraries, media, and similar resources. For some time we have been linked to a computer-based educational resource center where all materials cataloged in CIJE and ERIC, as well as others, are available to all our students. In each location that becomes a center, we attempt to provide functional library resources relevant to the area of study. Adult students, particularly teachers, generally have available to them professional libraries and other libraries, which function reasonably well for them. We rent media from school districts as well as providing them in centers. As was said recently on our campus by a member of a visiting team, "This is a situation much like professional life. One learns to find what one must have."

Varying enrollments and communication problems due to distance have also created problems. Additionally, varying enrollments often increase costs to painful levels. Communication is difficult enough when there is only one campus. In our case, we work on the problem with telephone service provided on a collect-call basis, frequent visits of regular staff, employment of a counseling staff, on-site staff, and in other ways.

Is an external program an asset or liability? We believe it is a decided asset in spite of the problems. The latter for us has included a period of serious disruption in the registrar and business offices as rather dramatic growth in numbers came about suddenly, and constant heavy activity was not limited any longer to three times a year. Also, we find that a single student problem in an external program can become a much greater problem than a similar one on the main campus. Thus, public relations are more perplexing. The constant vigilance regarding quality and the risks of being out front are both a challenge and an opportunity for us.

The assets from external degree programs vary from institution to institution. For us the primary ones seem to be

1. An increase in undergraduate and graduate campus enrollment
2. Faculty stimulation, growth, and opportunity
3. Expansion of campus staff to handle external program obligations adding to the variety and number of academic offerings on campus
4. Knowledge of and about our institution reaching new publics
5. Financial gain either from tuition or from donor gifts
6. Providing a needed service

We expect to continue and to expand our offerings into new areas, both geographically and academically. We are certain most colleges and universities will do so also. We expect continuous improvement in quality assurance. We believe a computer-based library of almost unlimited resources soon will be widely used. We believe radio, computers, and especially television will become the common delivery system for external programs in the future, and we intend to be involved in them.

Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Central Washington State College

Donald Schliesman joined Central Washington State College in 1957, where he has held teaching and administrative positions. He has served as a consultant for in-service education for teachers and for organizational development.

During fall 1973, the faculty at Central Washington State College approved the concept of granting a baccalaureate degree free of a residential study requirement. Before describing the program, I will review briefly the process the program underwent prior to its approval.

After considerable informal discussion, a proposal was written and submitted to the vice-president's Advisory Council for its information, reaction, and improvement suggestions. A rewritten proposal was then submitted to the Admission, Matriculation, and Graduation Committee, a faculty group responsible for making exceptions to the residence study policy. After incorporation of that committee's revisions, the proposal was considered by the Undergraduate Council, which is the faculty group primarily responsible for recommending policy changes in undergraduate study at Central.

Following that, the proposal was submitted and unanimously approved by the Faculty Senate. I believe this background detail is necessary to appreciate the excellent faculty support we now enjoy that has resulted from having involved the faculty in the decision-making process from the beginning. The hours spent explaining and responding to questions were well spent. A second purpose for reviewing the approval process is to illustrate fully that these programs are extensively considered and thoroughly reviewed before they are initiated.

Simply stated, Central's extended degree program consists chiefly of traditional courses of study leading to the baccalaureate degree, but which are taught at sites other than the campus in Ellensburg. It enrolls primarily students who are older than the traditional 18- to 22-year old college-age group. Probably Cyril O. Houle provided the best definition of a "first-generation" external degree in his book The External Degree (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973, p. 88):

> The extension degree, in its purest form, is one awarded on completion of a coherent and complete traditional degree program offering all necessary subjects and options at a time or place accessible to those who cannot come to the campus or whose other responsibilities make it necessary for them to spread their study over a longer period than does the student on campus. In admission, instruction, evaluation, and certification, few or no changes are made.

In all our programs except one, we are simply teaching our regular courses at locations other than the campus, with all the usual requisites for the bachelor's degree except for the residence study requirement. We do, however, require that students take a minimum of 45 quarter credits with CWSC professors if they wish to earn a degree from Central.

We decided to go the more traditional route of offering regular programs off campus because we simply did not have the time nor the resources to develop a sophisticated, assessment-based nontraditional program. Another reason was that external pressures were exerted on the college to respond to the needs of those who could not study on the campus. These pressures came from the legislature, the former Council on Higher Education, and potential students. A third reason was that Central was heavily involved in extension programs through Continuing Education, and many members of the faculty were experienced in working with the older students. And finally, the on-campus enrollment was declining and we were searching for more students. For these reasons, then, it did not seem logical to delay waiting for the resources necessary to develop programs and materials and train personnel for an individual, independent, at-home study degree program; thus emerged the extended degree concept.

The process whereby departments obtain authorization to offer their programs off campus is simple. With support of department faculty and the school dean, the chairman places the request before the Undergraduate Council, which speaks for the vice-president for Academic Affairs on the matter. Approval is dependent upon being able to demonstrate that: (1) there is an identified group of students whose needs would be met by the proposed program, (2) precautions have been taken to maintain academic standards as high as those in the same courses taught on campus, (3) an adequate student advising and record-keeping system has been developed and supported, (4) necessary curricular modifications have been approved, (5) arrangements for faculty resources have been made, (6) a director has been identified, and (7) arrangments have been made with local community colleges when appropriate.

Central is currently offering seven specializations off campus through its extended degree program: accounting and business administration, early childhood education, law and justice, liberal arts (interdepartmental major program), liberal studies, special education, and the vocational-technical trades and industrial major. An eighth one, allied health sciences, was approved late in the spring quarter but is not yet operational.

Through a grant from the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, we are, in cooperation with Yakima Valley Community College, currently developing a program in bilingual-bicultural education that will be offered through our extended degree program. All are regular offerings except two--liberal arts (interdepartmental) and liberal studies, both of which were developed in response to the interests or needs of specific groups. As of the last spring quarter, approximately 550 students had been admitted to these extended degree programs. The total off-campus programs generated approximately 15,000 student credit hours during the spring quarter. This figure includes enrollments in courses not associated with the various extended degree programs. In establishing off-campus programs, we work very closely with local community college officials to ensure no duplication of curricular offerings.

During the approval process mentioned above, any department requesting to offer a program off campus must identify a faculty member who will be administratively responsible for the program. The duties of the director include developing quarterly course schedules, providing for student advising, arranging for faculty, developing program evaluation, and, in some cases, arranging facilities; he also teaches part time. All programs are coordinated through one office, that of the assistant vice-president for Off-Campus Programs. The program directors are assisted by personnel from the various academic support services: the registrar's office, admissions, library, academic advising, and others, as well as by school deans and department chairmen.

Financing the programs has been accomplished primarily by drawing funds from the regular instructional budget. To some extent, the courses are self-supporting. We have received no special appropriation or funding to initiate these programs. The greatest expense has been faculty salaries; however, most of our faculty teach courses both on and off the campus as part of their regular load. To supplement them, adjunct professors with specialties not available in the regular faculty have been employed. In some cases, adjunct faculty has been added to assist the regular faculty in areas of high demand. They are considered for appointment following the same procedures of review and evaluation as regular faculty. Once approved by the Board of Trustees, they are employed on an individual course basis. Additional expenses include travel, materials, library resources, and facilities. Other than travel, the costs have been relatively minor, primarily because we have been able to negotiate agreements with community colleges and public schools to use their facilities at little or no charge.

In developing the program, several problems were encountered. Lack of coordination through one office led to confusion on the part of the program directors and some faculty. There was little communication between programs. Course scheduling between programs and requests for faculty of the various schools was not well coordinated. However, most of these problems have now been resolved by having all off-campus efforts coordinated by one administrative officer.

A second problem encountered early on was the need to modify slightly the admission policy and procedures--but not the standards. Because Central is a residential college, students are admitted to the institution well before registration. However, as regular programs were moved off campus, we discovered that students waited until the first meeting of a course to apply, which made it impossible to process their materials for admission prior to the beginning of the course. To accommodate late applications, our policy of nonmatriculated admission status had to be rewritten and is now applied to first-time enrollees. With nonmatriculated status, students may take as many courses as desired from Central as part-time students; however, to earn a degree, they must matriculate. Up to 45 quarter credits earned with nonmatriculated status may, with special approval, be allowed toward the degree.

Our campus in Ellensburg is located about 100 miles from the state's largest metropolitan area, Seattle. Not only does most of the campus student body come from that area, but also the majority of the off-campus enrollment is in the Seattle urban area. This means that faculty spend several hours driving to classes, time which is unproductive. It takes them away from research, writing, reading, advising students, curriculum development, and campus committee work. Increasingly, faculty are resenting those hours of travel. So, several have relocated to Seattle, having their full teaching load concentrated in off-campus programs. Considerations are underway to increase that number.

Another problem was to convince some faculty members that off-campus instruction is as academiclly respectable as that on campus. Interestingly, the problem decreased as the number of professors teaching off campus increased. Word spread quickly that mature off-campus students were interested in learning and that they provided, in many cases, a greater challenge to the professor than did on-campus students. Although the concern continues to be voiced, it comes primarily from those individuals who refuse to become involved in off-campus teaching.

Rising above the minimally adequate level of library resources at off-campus sites continues to be a problem. In most cases, public libraries are inadequate or inappropriate for many courses. Usually, community college library holdings are geared to lower division courses. Therefore, books, journals, and other resources from our campus library have been placed at off-campus sites for the duration of courses on a limited basis. However, doing so obviously interferes with on-campus use. Improving library resources is a problem with which we continue to struggle; it is a primary concern for us.

Several other items related to extended degree programs, although they have not been problems thus far for us, are concerns that should be mentioned. First is the possibility of increased external control being placed on institutions from sources such as state legislatures and state coordinating bodies. Notwithstanding their need and value, I know of nothing more stifling to initiative, creativity, and enthusiasm than having to complete forms and respond to an endless flow of "studies" that are being conducted. Those who may believe that such requests do not "control" should spend time at the receiving end.

Another concern is that the academic quality of extended degree programs is of paramount importance to those persons directing and teaching them. It seems to me that the opportunity for lower standards in off-campus programs may be greater than for on-campus ones (e.g., professors teaching classes after extended periods of travel, adjunct professors who may be moonlighting, students who take classes after full day's work, the absence of campus norms, and lack of complete library resources).

I believe a good way to check the academic quality of off-campus programs is to initiate a system of program review and evaluation at the same time that an extended degree program is established. If that is done, we can take pride in our work and know that our off-campus efforts represent significant contributions to society.

Barbara H. Mickey
Associate Vice-President and Dean
of Academic Development and Evaluation
University of Northern Colorado

Barbara Mickey is responsible for the development of nontraditional programs in her position as dean of Academic Development and Evaluation at the University of Northern Colorado. She is also a professor of anthropology and has done anthropological research in the southwestern United States and in Mexico. She has been extensively involved as a consultant and an evaluator of nontraditional educational programs.

The University of Northern Colorado began experimenting with the external or extended degree concept seven years ago. At that time, two separate but simultaneous efforts began. One led to the development of the Center for Special and Advanced Programs (CSAP), the other to the School of Educational Change and Development (SECD). Both have evolved over the years and continue to evolve. In addition, two other "external" models have come into being. One has led to several specific degree programs tailored to a discrete population such as a particular high school or junior high school and the nearby Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Control Center population. The other is the doctoral program in educational administration fielded jointly with La Verne College.

Center for Special and Advanced Programs

Preliminary planning for the CSAP program began in 1969 in order to provide nontraditional degree programs for federal, state, and local employees at upper division bachelor, master's, and specialist levels. This proved too ambitious, so by the summer 1971, CSAP was phasing out most of the baccalaureate programs and the specialist program and began to concentrate on fielding quality master's programs. We soon learned that it was not a simple prospect of moving off campus what was done on campus. New management systems needed to be devised, including procedures for the identification of student populations; communication with federal, state, and local industrial and military agencies; registration; identification and management of new resources such as faculty, space, intern sites, and support of various kinds; and in-service opportunities in the concept of nontraditional education for faculty and staff. Ways of handling the logistics of providing comprehensive programs away from the campus needed to be devised and implemented. Most important, procedures for quality control and continuing evaluation of courses and programs had to be developed and implemented.

Now, seven years later, the program has grown to include 30 locations--24 military sites and 6 civilian sites. Services to several others have been provided in the course of the program but have been phased out as conditions have changed. Several additional sites are being considered. Degree programs offered are a B.A. in business administration, and M.A. degrees in the area of business with specialization in management, communication with emphasis in human relations, counseling and guidance, recreation with emphasis in administration, and social science with emphasis in public administration.

Two new programs, not yet listed, have been added recently to our course offerings in the current catalogue. They are M.A. degrees in business, with an emphasis in health care administration (now available to students in one location), and in special education, with emphases in teaching socially and emotionally handicapped children and those with learning disabilities.

Recently, the Department of Elementary Education and Reading has proposed a modification of its degree for external delivery. In each case the degree programs have been developed by the relevant on-campus department faculty, and academic management is the responsibility of the department. The M.A. degree emphases in urban and regional planning, new communities, and sociology, as well as the B.A. in social science, have been phased out. By the end of the 1976 spring quarter, the CSAP program had graduated a total of 1,743 students.

Information about policies and procedures, costs and financial aid, program requirements, and course descriptions is given in the 1976-1977 CSAP catalog. There are specially designed degree programs offered through the Center for Non-Traditional and Outreach Education. Concurrent with the development of the CSAP program, several UNC departments began to experiment with program designs tailored for specific populations. Each is unique and was developed in conjunction with the prospective students and the employing agency. The pilot for these was one developed to provide an M.A. program in curriculum and instruction that would address the special problems of a Colorado school, as well as provide the teachers and staff of that school with study leading to an M.A. degree. Instruction was provided at the school and was directly related to the local concerns. Curricula and curricular materials were developed jointly by UNC faculty and the school's faculty and staff. The UNC Curriculum and Instruction Department learned much from this experience and has since worked with other schools. Currently, three similar programs are in progress in Colorado schools, with an enrollment totaling 254 students, 78 of whom have graduated. Both the School of Special Education and the Department of Science Education are offering one program of this sort, with enrollments of 71 and 79, respectively.

At the undergraduate level, the School of Business has developed a B.A. in business administration program for employees of the FAA Control Center at Longmont, Colorado. There are 72 current students enrolled in the program and 10 have graduated.

School of Educational Change and Development

The concept of SECD was conceived about the same time as CSAP and was developed as an on-campus program. Unlike the CSAP program, which provides traditional degree programs modified by a delivery system to meet the needs of nontraditional (employed adult) learners, SECD provides an opportunity for students to design their own programs. Degrees are offered at baccalaureate, master's, specialist, and doctoral levels.

After an initial interview with the dean of SECD, at which time students receive information about the procedures and format of the program, they develop a degree proposal. Proposals may include regular course work at UNC and other institutions, internships and apprentice-type experiences, individual study plans, professional development plans, practicums, and projects. Usually, SECD students spend 30 to 40 percent of their time on campus. Work done away from the campus is usually supervised by UNC staff. Although SECD students are in various parts of the country, they maintain close contact with the dean and with members of their resource boards. All students designate a group of faculty and others knowledgeable in the field of study to serve on their resource boards. Both the make-up of these committees and the program designs are reviewed, critiqued, and approved by the advisory committee of SECD before students are admitted to the school. The advisory committee, composed of UNC faculty and the dean of the Graduate School, makes policy decisions for SECD. Currently, there are 157 students working on programs of their own design through the school. As of the end of spring quarter 1976, SECD graduates numbered 19 B.A.'s, 53 M.A.'s, 59 Ed.D.'s and 1 D.A.

Doctoral Program in School Management

This program was developed and the pilot program was initiated in 1973 to provide practicing school administrators with a field-oriented degree program. As its major requirements, the three-year program includes participating in a series of five two-week institutional seminars, participating in a series of 12 change episodes, participating in cluster meetings, conducting a research project resulting in a dissertation, and attending UNC for one quarter. Specific programs are developed for all students through careful analysis of their individual strengths and weaknesses. The results of the analysis are utilized in assessing a candidate's potential success in the program, as well as in designing specific program elements and experiences to overcome demonstrated weaknesses.

The cluster meetings are roughly equivalent to the course work in a traditional graduate program. The clusters (located in California and Colorado) are composed of as many as 20 students, 2 practicing administrators, and 1 UNC or La Verne College faculty member; they meet an average of once a week during the quarter. Cluster topics are determined by student needs and vary from cluster to cluster. Adjunct faculty are utilized whenever necessary to provide expertise in specific areas.

Throughout the three years of the program, students complete a battery of 21 tests and must receive satisfactory scores and demonstrate competence in a number of knowledge and skill areas that have been identified as being essential to success as a school administrator. The program is subject to an annual external audit to determine if the program's objectives have been met.

Degree Program Delivery

The complexity of delivering degree programs such as those described above became obvious at UNC soon after their implementation. We found that many new logistical problems had to be solved. Student populations of sufficient size to make the program economically and educationally practical had to be identified. Program needs had to be assessed for each student population. Arrangements for space, on-site coordination, texts and other resources, and appropriate faculty had to be made. Because about 50 percent of the faculty utilized in the CSAP and Outreach Center Programs, plus all faculty in SECD, are full-time UNC faculty members, arrangements for such things as travel and overnight accommodations had to be made. Procedures for faculty selection, contracting, and orientation had to be developed. And additional procedures for the identification, review, selection, and orientation of adjunct faculty were needed. Faculty discovered that an intensive time frame required a reorganization of class materials and a rethinking of the faculty role.

As the programs grew to viable proportions, new considerations developed within the academic community. Faculty not participating in the programs--and some who were participants--expressed two primary areas of concern: (1) the quality of the academic program being offered away from the campus, or, in the case of SECD, in an individualized mode; and (2) the impact that the delivery of the programs might be having on the on-campus program, as additional faculty time was being used and faculty were (in the CSAP program) being drawn away from the campus.

In response to the first concern, the Board of Academic Control (BAC), a faculty committee drawn from the relevant departments, was organized in the second year of operation to develop academic policies for the CSAP program. The position of academic director was developed, and coordinators were selected from the faculty of each department offering an external degree program. Coordinators were given release time from teaching assignments based upon the size of their department's external programs. The coordinators are responsible to the academic director and to the department chairperson and dean. Coordinators review potential students' folders for admission to the program, coordinate the assessment of experience credit, assignment of teaching faculty, and preparation and reading of comprehensive exams. The academic director works with the BAC, the coordinators, and the staff that handles logistics in the field, and also monitors to ensure that policies established by the BAC, departments, and Faculty Senate are being met.

Three years ago the Faculty Senate, through its Academic Policies Committee, conducted an intensive two-year review of the CSAP program. A special faculty committee appointed by the UNC president studied the impact of the CSAP program on the on-campus program and found no significant impact. An Office of Evaluation was established last year to develop a systematic and ongoing evaluation procedure for the external degree programs. CSAP has undergone two on-site visits by North Central Association evaluators. SECD has also had an intensive review by a faculty-student-administrative committee, and the doctoral program is evaluated annually by an outside evaluator.

The programs continue to stimulate development of new procedures and directions. One program presently under consideration is the preparation of professionals for nontraditional programs. Questions to be addressed are What kinds of skills do staff and faculty need? How do they differ from those skills needed for a traditional assignment if they do? and, What kind of new curricular materials are needed to train personnel for nontraditional programs?

Another activity in which we are interested is a restatement of some traditional questions such as the need for residency in terms of its functions so that we can seek alternate ways to satisfy those functions.

In sum, the designing and delivering of external degrees and the activities that arise naturally from them promise exciting times ahead.

George E. McCabe
Director
Consortium of the California
State University and Colleges

George McCabe became director of the Consortium in 1973. Previously, he had served as executive secretary of the Commission on External Degree Programs for the California State University and Colleges. Dr. McCabe has held teaching and administrative positions at various colleges and universities and in social work organizations. Currently, he serves as an educational and a social work consultant.

Do we, the Consortium of the California State University and Colleges, have extended programs? It depends on what is being extended. If we are talking about extending the day into the evening, then we indeed do have extended programs--and have had them--for more than 25 years. Some of our urban campuses have almost as many people enrolled after 5 p.m. as they do during the daytime hours. Are we talking about extending the week into the weekend? If we are, then we have extended programs because we have held classes for many years on Saturdays, and now, in some cases, are offering "intensive weekend" programs that meet both Saturday and Sunday. Are we talking about geographic extension? If we are, then we have extended programs because we are taking entire programs off campus in both urban and rural areas. By our definition of external programs, only some of our extended programs, as I have just defined them, are external programs, and by far the larger number of students are enrolled in extended programs that are not external.

Do we have programs for the adult part-time learner? Yes, indeed, and we have had them for many, many more years than the term "external degree programs" has been in use in this country. When I first became a member of the faculty of the California State Colleges, 23 years ago, we had something called the "limited student," and coordinators of the Limited Student program. The term did not refer to the capability of the students, but rather to the fact that they were enrolled in limited programs--in other words, they carried six semester units of work or less per semester. Fortunately, we stopped using the unfortunate term limited student many years ago. In fact, our statistics on the number of adult part-time students enrolled on our campuses are less than precise because long ago we stopped counting these students any differently than we count any other students. We do know that last year there were more than 124,000 part-time students enrolled in programs offered by our 19 campuses. They represented almost 40 percent of our total enrollment. We know that almost 82,000 of these part-time students are over the age of 25, and almost 44,000 are over the age of [illegible]0. It is our guess that more than 60,000 adults over the age of 25 are enrolled in evening and weekend classes on campus. The last time we took an inventory, two years ago, we found that there were more than 400 upper division and graduate self-contained evening and weekend programs--self-contained in the sense that all upper division or graduate requirements for a degree could be completed in the evening or on weekends. These may be extended programs, but they are certainly not *external* programs by our definition.

Are our programs *nontraditional*? What is one institution's tradition is another institution's innovation. For example, the excellent extended university program of our host institution has innovated by designing programs for the part-time student. In the CSUC system this is a long-standing tradition. In any event, one must ask, traditional or nontraditional with respect to what? Traditional approaches to instructional delivery, traditional curricula, traditional student body?

In 1972, Glenn S. Dumke, chancellor of CSUC, presented a paper to the Board of Trustees in which he issued a call for innovation. His major emphasis was on innovative activity in our campus programs for regular students. In one portion of his address, however, he did emphasize the need to increase access to higher education for the adult part-time learner who is unable to spend extensive periods of time in residence on a campus. Shortly thereafter he appointed a Commission on External Degree Programs. Our mandate was not "Go forth and innovate," but rather, "Thou shalt go forth and do what must be done to increase access to higher education for the adult part-time learner." In four years we have made significant strides. There are now 45 programs that we call external degree programs, which serve in excess of 4,000 students.

What are the barriers to access that we have identified and tried to lower? Geography, obviously, is one. We are now taking upper division and graduate programs to remote sites in California. Time constraints are another barrier. If you are a traveling salesman, an airline pilot, or even a city planner, you may find it difficult or impossible to commit yourself to a schedule of two to three nights a week of classes. Intensive weekend schedules, independent study, and the use of self-pacing curricular modules have made it possible for us to provide instructional opportunities to students for whom traditional class schedules are not suitable.

Another barrier is the unavailability of programs in certain areas of the state. State resources are finite, and the allocation of these resources by our 19 campuses must take in a broad range of considerations beyond the needs of the adult part-time learner. Thus, in some areas, state-supported programs do not include curricular offerings that are available in other areas of the state from other campuses. External degree programs, as we define them, have assisted with this problem. In all, there are approximately 4,000 students currently enrolled in 45 external programs.

The final terminological problem is, What are external degree programs? Are they programs that are offered at sites remote to a campus? The answer is yes; in most instances external degree programs are offered off campus--but not in every instance. Our definition of external degree programs is an administrative one. They are upper division or graduate programs that are self-supported; that is, the programs are supported by student fees that, in some instances, are paid by the student, in some instances by federal assistance programs such as LEEP, and, in other instances by employers. Some of our external programs are actually held on our campuses. In such circumstances, these programs are external to the regular program of state funding of instruction, and the external programs represent an alternate source of funding. They are programs paid for by student fees in instances in which, for whatever reason, state-funded programs are not accessible to the adult part-time learner.

Recently, the Board of Trustees of CSUC adopted a policy under which, if resources are available, most programs now called external would be funded by state appropriation. If, within the next several years, state monies are actually made available for this purpose, it is likely that the term "external degree programs" will be limited to those programs that are established for specialized purposes such as programs offered under contract with the army, navy, or air force, or programs designed to serve the employees of industries or agencies and not open to the general public. Let it be clear that the overwhelming majority of adult part-time learners served by CSUC are served by regular, state-funded on-campus programs. There are 82,000 such individuals over the age of 25 presently enrolled in such programs, compared to around 4,000 in what we now call external programs.

In 1973, the Board of Trustees established the Consortium of the California State University and Colleges--the 1,000 Mile Campus. The Consortium was established to utilize more effectively the resources of the system: the resources of our 19 campuses. There are four functions of the consortium:

1. The consortium is responsible for the planning for and the monitoring of statewide programs of independent study that can serve Californians without respect to where they live and without respect to their other time schedule commitments. At present, there are three such programs. Two lead to degrees from California State College, Dominguez Hills, and one from California State College, Sonoma. The Dominguez programs lead to bachelor's and master's degrees, with a major in humanities. The Sonoma program leads to a bachelor's degree with a major in liberal arts.

2. A second function is to facilitate the development of collaboration programs. Here the goal is to make more efficient use of existing campus programs by bringing them to areas of the state in which the local state university campus does not have the resources to meet an identified need. For example, not all of our campuses have nursing curricula. Limitations on state resources being what they are, it is doubtful that additional nursing programs are going to be established. Thus, as one example, California State University, Los Angeles, is now delivering its nursing program in Ventura with the cooperation of California State University, Northridge, which is nearby. Northridge offers the related fields courses, and Los Angeles offers the professional courses in nursing. Next year, we will have curricula in nursing, criminal justice, home economics, engineering, and vocational education offered in this way. It is the job of the consortium to help the cooperating campuses define the terms under which they will cooperate in delivering heretofore unavailable curricula to new areas of the state.

3. The third function is one in which curricula are offered by the consortium itself, leading to consortium degrees. Multicampus Program Development Committees plan programs, and Multi-campus Academic Program

Committees constitute the statewide academic departments that guide the offerings of each program. The consortium now has seven statewide curricula that it is offering in 23 areas of the state, with an enrollment of approximately 1,000 students. This approach--meeting heretofore unmet educational needs of the adult part-time student--has taken root and, in the past term, we experienced a 55 percent increase in enrollment. The consortium has just received full accreditation from the senior accrediting commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for those programs leading to consortium degrees.

4. The fourth function of the consortium is one of competency assessment. We have just completed three years of study of the New York Regents Examinations in business administration. These examinations have been normed and validated using the CSUC campus students. Likewise, we have undertaken studies of a number of CLEP examinations, for which the consortium now grants credit. In addition, as a result of a grant from CAEL (the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning), the consortium has established procedures for individual assessment of prior learning for all students enrolled in consortium programs. And it will be announced soon that the consortium will be the agency in California for the American Council on Education's Project on Noncollegiate-Sponsored Instruction.

Thus far, the consortium has limited its activities to the assessment of prior learning for students enrolled in programs leading to consortium degrees. In the coming year, a feasibility study will be undertaken to determine whether the consortium should establish an educational registry/credit bank and advisory service that would serve students without respect to whether they would be earning a degree from the consortium or from one of the CSUC campuses. One characteristic I want to emphasize is the extent to which the consortium is tied to the Statewide Academic Senate of CSUC. The Advisory Committee of the consortium is a committee of the Academic Senate, and the Statewide Academic Senate plays a role with respect to the consortium analogous to the role that campus Academic Senates play to campus programs. This is a central and essential role.

In the development of consortium programs we go through normal faculty consultative approval procedures. Regular CSUC faculty develop and approve consortium programs. In the main, regular faculty from our campuses serve as instructors in our programs. We do not farm out curricular development to outside entrepreneurs. We do not put our programs out for franchisers to run for us. We think the legitimacy and credibility of our degrees depends upon the development and control of programs by continuing bodies of regular faculty, and we have no intention of attempting to meet the educational needs of the people of other states by extending our programs beyond the boundaries of California.

The California State University and Colleges do not think external or extended programs are our central mission, and we react with horror to the notion that we might have ten or twelve times as many students in off-campus programs taught by "pick-up" faculty as we have in on-campus programs. We believe that extended or external or nontraditional or innovative programs should have control towers--towers to control flights of rhetoric. For that reason, we allocate 10 percent of the budget for all external programs to evaluation. We require an approved evaluation design as part of each proposal for a program, and we rely upon independent evaluators for the purpose of carrying out the evaluation. The evaluation of consortium programs suggests that our students are highly satisfied, that our faculty believe that external programs are at least as good as on-campus programs, and--for the adult part-time learner--possibly superior.

But we are viewed with suspicion by many faculty and many administrators, and we are better because of it. There are lots of ready "buzz words," but no easy answers to the improvement of educational opportunities. We do not reject traditional education out of hand. We believe the surest road to the improvement of education is the toughest. We do not circumvent the established educational structure, we stay within it. We fight for credibility every inch of the way, and we believe that the soundest thing that can be done at any given time is what the academic community believes to be the soundest. We fight for the principle of allowing diversity on the grounds that it is dangerous to think that any given group has a toe hold on the truth, whether it be those who rely exclusively on lecture-discussion, or the new answer proclaimed by some: competency-based instruction. Sometimes we are nontraditional in curriculum, sometimes in instructional delivery--once in awhile in both. The consortium, itself, in the way in which it is organized to utilize the resources of a professoriate of 16,000 without violating the autonomy of the 19 individual university and college campuses, is innovative. Some of our curricula are not innovative, often our instructional delivery is not--and we are proud of these programs, too.

Serving People: Discovering Needs, Meeting Needs

Nancy Tapper

The focus of this session was on students and their educational needs. Discussion covered the identification of potential students and specific educational needs and interests that could be served effectively through extended degree programs.

Nancy Tapper
President
Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study

> Nancy Tapper is currently serving as president of Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study in Berkeley, California. Formerly, she was dean at Metropolitan Regional Learning Center at Empire State College in New York, a nontraditional institution, before going to Peralta.

I want to focus on discovering extended degree needs, which are an essential prerequisite to meeting these needs. Most of us have paid considerably more attention to ways of meeting identified and identifiable needs than we have to discovering needs. Even if we accept the definition of extended degree programs--those programs that are open and flexible enough to respond to the needs of nontraditional students--how do we know what those needs are? Perhaps we should also add that extended degree programs should be those that are inventive and imaginative enough to help all kinds of people to discover and articulate their needs, and then which are open and flexible enough to respond to those needs.

As learning experts, we ought to be able to design programs that can meet any learning need. But what actually happens with much of continuing education/lifelong learning is that the rich seem to get richer. Instead of raising the learning levels of all people, we seem to be, in many cases, widening the gap between the haves and have nots of education. For example, the Open University of England was intended to have an impact on a very large number of people who otherwise would have had no opportunity to get a higher education. Yet the majority of the first entrants were professionals who already had a high educational level. At Empire State College, the majority of students were those who already had some college experience, and who were not economically or educationally disadvantaged. It has been said that there is good statistical support for the statement that extended educational opportunities have, for the most part, served the same students as the traditional systems--the only difference being that the new students are older.

Why is this true? Are we not giving the right offerings to meet the needs? What are the needs anyway? In the past several years, there has been an increasing interest in the area of needs assessment. (One can tell that it is a legitimate area now since it has been quantified, modeled, and jargonized.) Most frequently, needs assessment consists of a relatively passive closed information-gathering process--use of a questionnaire on an entire population or on a sample, interviews with prospective clients, or questionnaires on interviews with community leaders. Interestingly, needs assessment results themselves point up what is inadequate about this process, for example:

1. One needs study was done recently in California, using seven different communities and a complex arrangement of questionnaires and interviews with both a sample of community people and with community leaders. One of the communities was North Oakland, and the most interesting aspect of the results was the great discrepancy between the community leaders' perceptions of educational needs and the peoples' responses concerning their needs. For example, 81 percent of the people expressed a desire to continue their education--leaders estimated 48 percent would want to; 73 percent selected as their reason for such a desire "to be better informed"--leaders estimated 22 percent would have that reason; and 22 percent expressed an interest in a four-year degree while only 9 percent was the leaders' estimate. Without saying which figures are "correct," clearly there are some problems!

2. There were many interesting results of the work of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study in 1972. People were asked their preferred method for learning; the most preferred answer was lecture or classroom. (Only 1 percent chose TV, 2 percent travel-study, etc.) This is a perfect example of the fact that you want what you know, not know what you want.

3. The same study contained a question concerning perceived barriers to learning. Given 25 choices of reasons why they had not returned to education, people most frequently chose answers having to do with lack of money, lack of time, and self-perception (such as too old and too low grades in the past). The 12th most frequent response was finally one having to do with what is offered: "What I want doesn't seem to be available" (12 percent).

It simply is not enough to ask the community, What do you want? and then give it to them. It also is not enough to sit back proudly and display our wares and expect that people will be ready to come to us for them. What we are struggling with is a complex problem not just of communication but also of education. Some of the elements of this problem are:

1. Self-image: Adults frequently tend to exaggerate their inadequacies, their age, and their lack of time, particularly if they previously have had disappointing experiences.

2. Image of the traditional institution: The image of academe as exclusionary and elitist still persists, sometimes justifiably.

3. Image of the nontraditional institution: People already well educated tend to be "institutionally savvy" and are more able to accept nontraditional models, while others less academically sophisticated tend to be more wary and fearful that the innovative institution may not be a "real" college.

4. Lack of information: This is an obvious problem that still persists. Although each institution does extensive work on its own publicity, little has been done to coordinate information and make it all easily accessible in one location.

5. Lack of conviction: There is, on the part of individuals, a question of a payoff for more education. Again, this attitude is more prevalent on the part of those who previously had bad experiences in education. Clearly, unemployment has not helped with this problem.

What can be done? We have to build bridges between the person in the street and education. We have concentrated our educational offerings on those which help people to cope more intelligently and capably with job, with family, and with life, but we have neglected to help people cope intelligently and capably with education. We must create some transitional experiences that will be very attractive to the people who are not likely to be self-movers into education: experiences that demand minimal commitment in terms of time and money; experiences that are clearly nonthreatening and nonpunitive, and that will--briefly--turn people on, whet their appetites for education, and build up their self-confidence.

There are many possible forms that such transitional experiences could take. One structure that has been suggested to create better bridges is the assessment/counseling/referral center. These are centers where people would be aided in assessing their present competencies and would be counseled as to the best educational resource to meet their objectives. This is an important suggestion but I believe it important that such a service be decentralized through such ways as vans, circuit-riding counselors, and neighborhood services. Some other possible bridges are short courses or workshops, given in convenient locations, and with subject matter of immediate usefulness. (A number of actual examples were given here, such as a one-day workshop on rights and services for older citizens offered in Spanish at a Senior Center.)

This process of educating people to an awareness of their needs and of their capacities is an essential part of needs assessment for educational institutions. It is not so clear and quantifiable as a questionnaire result, but it signals a change in the view of the role of a college. Rather than seeing the college as a passive dispenser of education for those who come to it, we should see the educational institution in a more dynamic, pervasive role as a seller of learning, and as something exciting that is doable and which has rewards.

State Responsibility in Extended Degree Programs

Patrick M. Callan and Donald J. Nolan

The presenters for this session discussed the extent to which states have a responsibility for promoting and facilitating extended degree programs and what the state role should be in coordinating extended degree programs. State assistance in providing counseling and appropriate services to potential students was also examined.

Patrick M. Callan
Executive Coordinator
Washington State Council for
Postsecondary Education

> As the executive coordinator, Patrick Callan is involved in statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary education in Washington. Previously, he served as director of the Montana Commission on Postsecondary Education and as staff director for the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California State Legislature. He is a commissioner for the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

From the perspective of the state coordinating agency, the role of statewide agencies in meeting needs for new educational services cannot be dealt with in isolation. Instead, it must be examined in the context of overall agency mission and the conditions and direction of statewide planning in the mid-1970s.

Responsibility of the State Coordinating Agency

Assuming that the need for new educational services is established, what is the role of the state planning/coordinating agency in developing a public policy responsive to those needs? What is the role of statewide planning in assuring that new educational needs are met?

Normally, state higher education or postsecondary education agencies are neither providers of educational services nor direct participants in those aspects of the political process that allocate public resources to the major services funded by state governments (e.g., common schools, human services, health services, transportation, natural resources, and higher education). Yet they have important relationships to both the providers and the allocators.

The statutes under which most operate contain language similar to that charge to the Washington Council for Postsecondary Education. The Council is to "engage in overall planning for postsecondary education in the state," and to

> assess and define the educational needs of the state to be served by postsecondary education; recommend

> and coordinate studies to ascertain how defined needs are being met; study and make recommendations concerning adult education, continuing education, public service and postsecondary educational programs; identify priorities among defined needs and specify the resources necessary to meet them. . . .

Thus, the tasks of synthesizing disparate perceptions of the learning needs of the state, allocating institutional responsibilities, and identifying the necessary resources are the basic responsibilities of the statewide agencies. These tasks involve both traditional and non-traditional needs, although, throughout their brief history, most of these agencies have been preoccupied with planning to meet the enrollment demands of conventional college-age students attending conventional institutions.

While the state's response to needs for new services is part of its responsibility and concern, these needs must be seen in the broader context of all the needs for education beyond high school. Recall also that the agencies are called upon to "identify priorities among defined needs," which implies that some needs must take precedence over others.

Thus, it is important to consider the environment in which public policy for higher/postsecondary education is being developed, and the impact of this environment upon the planning underway in many states, before focusing specifically on the provision of new services.

The Context of Current State Planning Activities

Most statewide planning and coordination that has taken place in the United States has occurred since 1960 and has been oriented to accommodate dramatically increased enrollments in the 18- to 21-year-old age group. In fact, while the origins of state coordination go back about 35 years, most coordinating agencies were established during the period of the most rapid growth in the history of American higher education. In 1940 there were only 2 coordinating boards in the United States and 3 in 1950; by 1960 there were 11, and by 1970 there were 27.

That state coordination and planning expanded during a time of growth is no coincidence. As a rule, coordinating boards were charged either explicitly or implicitly with assisting state governments in assimilating this growth in an orderly and efficient manner. Planning was a matter of developing rational policies for dividing up an ever-expanding pool of students and resources. Accordingly, state master plans produced during this period tended to be blueprints for expansion. Viewed from this perspective, state planning was a response to a particular set of problems and issues in a particular era, orchestrating expansion during a period of unprecedented growth in numbers of students and amounts of resources.

It is evident that the agenda has altered drastically. If planning was once concerned with the rationalization of growth, it now centers on the allocation of scarcity. The factors that have produced this inversion are familiar: declining participation rates among the traditional clientele--the high school senior--to be followed shortly by a shrinkage in the absolute size of the pool; inflation; increasingly constrained state budgets; and a leveling and even decline in the portion of public funds allocated to postsecondary education in many states, the latter reflecting a shift of state emphasis from higher education to other societal needs. There are no indications that any of these trends are likely to be reversed in the near future.

Thus, the current planning environment is oriented to stability and retrenchment rather than to expansion. Many state planners have concluded that political, fiscal, and demographic realities are such that new programs and services will be provided only at the expense of current activities--whether one is talking about conventional degree programs or new types of learning services. Reallocation through more frequent and intensive reviews of programs is the major theme of several of the state plans promulgated in the last year or two.

Few people need to be reminded that this type of planning, even when done well, results in defensiveness on the part of institutions of higher education. This is not the kind of environment in which new ideas are easily introduced or accepted. Institutions fight desperately to hold on to what they have--faculty, dollars, and programs. Change is perceived of as threatening. And because the proportion of resources allotted to postsecondary education is stabilizing, institutions are resisting not only changes in their own roles but also the creation of new services anywhere in the system because of potential competition for resources or students. This not only interferes with expanded services to new populations, but it reduces the variety of such institutional sorties as well.

The responses to needs that occur, then, tend to have two characteristics:

1. They are perceived by the institution as solutions for the maintenance of faculty, dollars, or programs that would otherwise be jeopardized.

2. They involve the provision of a traditional service in a conventional way, with some minor modification--such as the offering of a class at a time or place more convenient to potential students. Because such responses are relatively easy (involving mainly new times and places) and are certainly familiar, and because individual institutions perceive such responses as routes to an improved institutional fiscal situation, they appear to be rushing in on an individual basis. This, in turn, stimulates disorder and redundancy, making the avoidance of duplication and inefficiency, rather than the provision of new educational services, the crucial planning issue.

Most coordinating agencies are under pressure from state governors and legislatures to assure orderly development and to see that development takes place in response to legitimate, carefully prioritized public needs. There is widespread suspicion that institutional interests in providing new services are merely responses to the prospect of declining enrollments. This confounds the planning imperative. It also makes it difficult to ensure that the planning issue focuses on demonstrable public needs and the most responsible ways of meeting them, not on the motivations of individuals or institutions.

Planning Issues

Until now I have indicated that the assessment and response to educational needs is a primary responsibility of state planners, and that the emphasis of state plans has shifted from meeting needs through augmented resources to meeting them through reallocation. State planning in a time of scarce dollars is especially concerned with efficiency. Some issues that state plans must address in relation to servicing new clienteles at new times and places and utilizing new strategies and technologies for learning, evaluation, and certification need to be identified.

1. The nature and magnitude of needs must be clearly identified. This means that need assessments must be precise in the identification of educational requirements, the populations to be served, and the resources required.

The recent Postsecondary Alternatives Study commissioned by the California Legislature provides an example of the type of documentation required. The study found demonstrable needs in seven areas:

- Help to individuals in locating appropriate educational opportunity
- Individual counseling and career planning
- Equity for part-time students
- Programs for groups with special needs such as those who are elderly, handicapped, unemployed, ethnic minorities, high school dropouts, poor, institutionalized, and women returning after an absence from education
- More "external" upper-division programs
- Individualized degree opportunities
- Certification of competence without instruction.

2. The approach to meeting the identified need should be specified. The crucial question is whether to utilize established institutions and agencies, create new organizational mechanisms, or rely on some combination of the old and the new. This is also a difficult political issue. State plans in Montana and Washington have stressed the necessity of making existing institutions more responsive to new needs, often through interinstitutional cooperation. The California studies have called for some reform of existing institutions and policies, as well as the creation of new entities to meet the needs cited by the Montana and Washington studies. It is possible that the prospect of a new entity intensifies pressures on existing institutions to demonstrate their capability to be responsive.

3. The issue of funding must be addressed. Who should pay and how much? How much state support? How much client or user support? Should state subsidies be greater or less than subsidies provided the users of the older conventional systems? Are the budgetary mechanisms--primarily formulas--currently in use adaptable to the new services? What modifications will be required?

4. How and when will the new services be evaluated? Who will be responsible for evaluation? Which criteria will be utilized? At a time when all programs and program proposals are coming under rigorous scrutiny, it is unrealistic to assume that the newer, less traditional activities will be exempt just because they are new. In Washington, where the initiation of

state-level coordination of off-campus offerings occurs this year, evaluation of the effectiveness of such offerings is scheduled to occur at the end of the second year.

The appropriate response to each of these four, as well as to related issues, will vary with each state, the needs of its population, and the extant historical and institutional patterns.

Having been involved in postsecondary planning in several states, I can testify that there are not many models that can be exported easily. Yet I believe that state planning is the appropriate mechanism for the identification and legitimization of new needs and for the formuation of strategies to meet those needs. State planning is also the most useful vehicle for proposing processes and criteria for reallocation among programs and institutions. The purpose of state planning is to offer a conceptual and institutional framework within which state educational goals can be achieved. While such planning is not sufficient to assure the achievement of all goals, it is certainly a necessary first step.

The Washington Approach

Bearing in mind the lack of exportable models, I want to describe some of our thinking on the delivery of off-campus services in the state of Washington. I believe this may be useful--not because we have found the ultimate solutions, even for our problems--but because it illustrates the ways in which the issues discussed at this conference overlap with other planning issues. It involves both state-level and institutional planning and both traditional and nontraditional concerns.

Washington's system of higher education includes 27 community colleges, whose combined districts encompass the state, 4 state colleges, and 2 universities, as well as 12 regionally accredited private colleges and universities. There are also a growing number of nonaccredited indigenous educational enterprises, as well as branch campuses of institutions accredited elsewhere, and a substantial array of proprietary schools.

From the multitude of concerns, several emerge as priority items on the state planning agenda: (1) identifying and meeting educational needs, (2) finding a role for the regional state colleges, and (3) coordination. Within this environment it has been suggested that the two state universities focus on meeting the needs for advanced professional continuing education in such fields as medicine, law, veterinary medicine, and dentistry, and for providing off-campus television instruction, largely because of the presence of such resources at these institutions.

The primary public responsibility for general upper division and graduate off-campus instruction is that of the state colleges. The community colleges have responsibility for off-campus instruction at the lower division level. State college primary service areas (the areas from which they draw the bulk of their on-campus enrollments) suggest a natural framework for institutional spheres of off-campus activity, mitigated somewhat by programmatic differences between these institutions.

This requires consideration for several reasons, however. For example, the proximity of an institution to an off-campus learning site does not seem the primary determinant of educational quality in the off-campus course.

While there is good reason to assign responsibility for meeting a given need to the nearest institution, there is also a danger that this method, if done slavishly, would create the possibility that the need would go unmet. (Institutions differ, plus there is a danger that service boundaries become quasi-legal benchmarks against competition.)

Thus, a balance is required. Institutions should be expected to respond to educational needs in communities that they have traditionally served, if they have the programmatic resources to do so. But they should also be able to meet needs outside these communities. The problem is really one of coordination rather than distance. In Washington we believe that coordination can be attained through a requirement of institutional off-campus programming on an annual basis as well as the state-level review and coordination of such plans. Arrangements for addenda can ensure the maintenance of responsiveness.

This approach differs dramatically from those of other states, especially those employing geographic regions and consortia. This is where the statewide agency enters the picture. To it goes the responsibility for identifying the need, determining how it is met in other states, and developing responses that fit the particular political, cultural, and fiscal realities of its jurisdiction.

Stimulation and Constraint

It is clear to all of us that Washington lacks the resources to do all that we want accomplished. The statewide coordinating/planning agency is often in an excellent position to make decisions on either an advisory or binding basis as to where limited funds are to be directed: to certain conventional programs, off-campus programs, new approaches, and the like. Often it is our responsibility to say, "This seems like a fine thing but we cannot do it now." Another negative function is to decide to let certain things die without assistance. Yet we are also in a position to recommend positive shifts of resources in response to public needs, and we have greater freedom to do so than do our institutions with their established programs, growing proportions of tenured faculty, etc.

Earlier I indicated that institutional responses to new needs usually involve attempts to accommodate those needs through conventional modes with minor modifications. If we are to attempt to achieve greater institutional responsiveness, as we have committed ourselves to in Washington, we must learn more about the process of stimulating institutional responsiveness that focuses on learner needs rather than on institutional needs. One way is to stimulate experimentation through encouragement of funds for incentives to innovation, both with respect to the state legislature and through our involvement with external programs such as the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and Title I of the Higher Education Act.

In short, our approach to the provision of new services will be characterized by caution and by careful analysis. Programs most likely to attract our support in a time of general reassessment and intense resource competition are those with clear and defensible goals; carefully developed models of delivery, which preferably have been field tested prior to their large-scale implementation; and provision for evaluation. Coordinating agencies will be calling for more rigorous thinking in the design of programs and for more emphasis upon evaluation based upon performance.

I acknowledge the conceptual and editorial assistance of C. William Chance of the Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education.

Donald J. Nolan
Director
Regents External Degree Program
State University of New York

Coordinator
Academic Programs in Higher Education
New York State Department of Education

Donald Nolan has served as a lecturer and a consultant on external degrees, the open university, and nontraditional education throughout the United States and Europe. In addition to his work with the Regents External Degree Program in New York, he has had teaching and administrative experience in that state.

To illustrate the far-ranging effects of a state's active role in promoting and facilitating greater access to postsecondary education, including extended degree programs, the legal and educational structure in New York that has resulted in the Regents' active and direct involvement in educational innovations (such as the extended degree program) must be understood. Created by the state legislature in 1784 as the Regents of the State of New York, the "institution" was intended, in the short run, to provide trustees for King's College (later, Columbia University); in the long run, it was to establish a unified educational system for the people of New York under the control of state government. Today it is the oldest continuous educational agency in the nation.

The university encompasses and has responsibility for all things educational in the state, including the private and public higher institutions (New York has more than 200), as well as the elementary and secondary schools, museums, libraries, historical societies, and other agencies whose primary concern is education. It is the source of all degree-granting authority within the state, although traditionally it has been delegated to individual colleges and universities. With the establishment of Regents External Degrees in 1971, however, the Regents now exercise this authority on their own behalf. The Regents also have legal responsibility for a comprehensive quadrennial "Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education," which requires all higher institutions to systematically develop education objectives in response to the priorities of the Regents.

Through policy and precedent, the Regents have sought to encourage, facilitate, and assess college-level learning among many adults who, for whatever reason, do not attend conventional colleges or universities, but who are participating in some way in the vast educational resources of the state. Through the Regents External Degree Program (REDP), the College Proficiency Examination Program (CPEP), the Credit Bank with transcript and evaluation services, and, most recently, a systematic approach to the evaluation of courses offered by business, industry, government, and other sponsors whose primary purpose is not education, the Regents facilitate recognition of and movement between all types of meaningful learning experiences. These services and programs are available on a voluntary basis and are accessible to students and higher education institutions alike. A total of $1.3 million is spent annually in state funds, student fees, and foundation grants to support these activities.

In addition to this direct participation in providing increased educational options, the Regents also encourage and foster experimentation and innovation by the state's conventional colleges and universities through the Regents' regulatory functions of accreditation and registration of programs. New curricular design, instructional methodology, assessment of knowledge gained through experience, flexible scheduling of courses, and time-shortened degrees are some of the areas in which traditional institutions have responded in serving adults.

The State University of New York, the public educational system of the State, has established Empire State College, which is an extended degree program of the "contract" type. It stresses individualized instruction and assessment principally through one-to-one relationships between students and faculty mentors. Five other New York institutions participate in the well-known University Without Walls Program. Syracuse University, the State University College at Brockport, and the City University of New York have all established bachelor's degrees that allow individuals to proceed at their own pace.

In a 1974 survey of college practices in granting credit for knowledge gained through experience, at least 26 institutions, of which 18 are from the private sector, had established a mechanism for assessing prior learning. More are being planned and are being discussed in faculty senates.

For adults who are unable or unwilling to come to the campus, almost all colleges and universities provide alternate classroom sites--through extension courses in public libraries and business settings, satellite centers, and branch campuses. At 12 institutions, a phenomenon in flexible class scheduling known as the "Weekend College" allows individuals to take courses and even complete a degree program through intensive classroom instruction from Friday through Sunday.

In essence, the Regents' approach to opening up higher education has been pluralistic, encouraging the development of extended degree programs of three basic types--examining, contracting, and campus-based, in both public and private institutional settings. Additionally, traditional colleges and universities in New York have expanded the scope of their missions to serve the nontraditional learner, while offering more flexible arrangements in providing instruction for all students. It is not surprising, then, that four New York State institutions--Empire State College, Syracuse University, SUC at Brockport, and the Regents External Degree Program--are included in Lee Medsker's Nontraditional Education Project.

A burgeoning number of postsecondary options naturally create confusion among the public. Individuals with particular circumstances not only want to know the attributes and utility of a certain course or college or program, but also the costs connected with it and its acceptance in terms of credit and transfer to other, often conservative, institutions. Can they participate in a given educational program while continuing to work or to meet family responsibilities? Is financial assistance available for a particular course of study, for a particular economic group, for veterans, or for the disabled? How does one apply? What are the features of such new financial assistance vehicles as New York's Tuition Assistance Program (TAP), and which financial aid programs can be used for part-time or noncredit study?

There is little doubt that people need and want better information about the many-faceted postsecondary opportunities available. Several major national reports, such as Diversity by Design, The Report of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study, and Less Time, More Options, called for more counseling centers to disseminate information, handle referrals, deliver diagnostic testing, and identify sources of financial support. The New York State Board of Regents, in its 1972 Statewide Plan for the Development of Postsecondary Education, addressed the same concerns. In 1974, the Regents launched an important two-year study of adult education in the state under the direction of Norman Kurland. A major finding of the Kurland study and other recent Regents'-sponsored surveys has been the need of some 2 million New Yorkers for postsecondary advice and counseling and clear evidence that these people desire it.

In a related effort, the Regents have spent $1.5 million of funds of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Title I) to study the needs of unaffiliated learners and to catalog the types and sources of postsecondary educational opportunities available to them. In every region of the state, the studies have revealed a disparity between the number of adults who rate continuing education important and the number who actually take advantage of continuing education opportunities. Chief among the reasons cited for not participating were the lack of information and counseling services to aid in the decision-making process and the lack of financial resources available for part-time study.

To fill the expressed need for information and advisory services for adults interested in continuing their education, the Regents have again encouraged the development of diverse models and delivery systems, both on the campus and in the community.

More than 30 New York academic institutions have established women's centers that feature education and career information resources and are often staffed by professionals and volunteers to assist women returning to or beginning anew a college career. Another special group--the veterans--has been adequately served in the academic community by the addition of a veteran's advisor to the existing counseling staffs.

Outside the academic community, several important "independent" community-based advisory systems have been established in New York. The Regional Learning Service of Central New York accommodates the five counties centered around the city of Syracuse, using a network of 24 mobile, trained part-time counselors. The New York City Regional Center for Lifelong Learning provides postsecondary educational information and referrals by telephone. In a one-year period, more than 5,000 requests for information, the vast majority career related, were received by the center. In order to be effective, these type of services must use radio, television, and other media services to acquaint the adult population with their existence. Besides the problem of gaining an identity, almost all new community-based advisory services have tremendous start-up costs that must be offset by grants from private or governmental sources until other sources of support, such as client fees, are generated.

On a statewide level, the Regents External Degree Program coordinates a network of 150 volunteer advisors, primarily from two- and four-year academic institutions, but also including advisers from public libraries; community service organizations such as the Cooperative Extension, Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation and YWCAs; hospitals and health service agencies; and other educational institutions, including regional Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (which provide secondary and adult basic educational services). Graduates of REDP also serve as volunteer advisers, sharing their first-hand experiences from preparing for a proficiency examination to locating appropriate learning resources with other prospective independent learners. Volunteer advisers serve with the full cooperation and support of their home institution, providing their information and advisory services to unaffiliated learners in addition to their full-time occupations.

Many of the advisers are professionally trained counselors; all have received special orientation on the external degree student. A comprehensive manual containing information on credit by examination programs, credit recommendations for evaluated military, business, and industry courses, and other nontraditional and traditional educational offerings is provided to each adviser. Semiannual meetings are held to provide updated information, as well as an opportunity to exchange information on the problems and concerns of the unaffiliated learner.

Participation from the traditional academic community is purposefully sought as a majority--more than 63 percent of Regents candidates take college courses after enrollment. Academically based counselors assist them in selecting appropriate courses to fulfill external degree requirements. Although the network is coordinated through the REDP, the advisers are charged not only with advising external degree candidates, but also with directing clients to other, perhaps more traditional, academic programs that may better serve their interests. Of the 12,000 clients who contacted advisers during 1975, 6 of 10 were not interested in REDP, but were seeking general information on the whole range of educational opportunities and special assistance in determining how their past educational experiences would be assessed in terms of academic credit. Only a small percentage--less than 15 percent--later enroll in an external degree program; the majority find other nontraditional programs or the campus better suited to their needs.

Another statewide program that features information and advisory services primarily for adults outside the educational system is the Adult Independent Learner Advisory System (AILAS), which is housed in public libraries across the state. Beginning in late 1973, New York librarians began to develop a formal approach to providing information, advisory services, and learning resources to assist principally adult independent learners who learn on their own by choice or by necessity. To prepare for their new role, teams of librarians attended training workshops sponsored by the State Education Department's Office of Library Development in cooperation with the CEEB's Office of Library Independent Study to become familiar with basic interviewing techniques, interpersonal communication skills, basic decision-making processes, and the theoretical basis for understanding the adult learner. Each of the teams then trained additional branch, reference, and adult services librarians in their localities to produce librarians sensitive to adult learners' needs and interests in continuing their education.

In the area of learning resources, the public libraries are making special efforts to support the nontraditional students enrolled in REDP, Empire State College, or CPEP. Aided by a $1-million federal grant from the Library Services and Construction Act, the public libraries have established separate academic collections of textbooks, audio-visual cassettes and equipment, and learning modules for these students. Most materials are available on a circulation basis and are specially indexed with call numbers keyed to CPEP and REDP study guides.

The lessons of AILAS are beginning to be learned. One of the most apparent facts is that adults want to receive recognition for what they know or will learn, thus indicating that they need to be referred or connected in some way with the academic community. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education recently awarded the Regents a grant to demonstrate that the public library could play an important intermediary role between adults who perceived themselves outside the academic community (but who had a desire for continuing education) and the traditional academic community.

The grant will fund a demonstration project in three pilot libraries to provide information to adults on the wide variety of postsecondary educational opportunities, both traditional and nontraditional, which are available to them. Full-time librarians, especially trained in advisement techniques and provided with the appropriate information, will be placed in three or four public libraries across the state. The advisers will make use of the library's established sources of information in implementing their task, and they will work closely with and be advised by staff and faculty at colleges and universities in the local area. The project is designed to serve the educational needs of adults, and, in so doing, to encourage enrollments in institutions of higher learning.

These various information and counseling services illustrate the Regents' philosophical approach to educational matters in the State: namely, that a diversified but well-designed academic community, combining the traditional with the nontraditional, the innovation with the proven academic tradition, ultimately will create better learning environments and services for the customary student as well, and can only enhance the quality of education for all.

Financing Extended Degree Programs

Richard Gustafson and George J. Nolfi

State responsibility for and involvement in extended degree programs cannot be thoroughly discussed without touching on the matter of finances. It is clear that persons involved in any facet of extended degree programs throughout the West have a major concern about finance. In this session the presenters addressed four major questions: (1) How are extended degree programs presently financed? (2) What are the key financial issues? (3) What are reasonable options for financing extended degree programs? and (4) How far can we expect society to go in supporting education for adults?

Richard Gustafson
State Representative
Oregon

Richard Gustafson is a member of the Oregon House of Representatives where previously he served on the Joint Ways and Means Committee. Currently, he is chairman of the Interim Committee on Post-Secondary Education in which continuing education is a primary subject. He is a member of the Board of Directors of Mount Hood Community College in Gresham, Oregon, and is a staff member of the University Relations Department at Portland State University.

As a state representative, I will discuss some of the policy problems of adult and continuing education as they have evolved through the years, and, in the process, will sound a warning of sorts to higher education. The solution to its future economic problems will not be found in restructuring its organizations to meet the special needs of greater numbers of nontraditional students. Instead, it will be found in how well it meets the total needs of society as the knowledge-producing community--rather than as traditionally viewed and therefore traditionally isolated educational institutions.

My remarks are to be viewed from the following perspectives: (1) I will exercise legislative license to overstate my case, although I will accept corrections; (2) I will speak from the perspective of Oregon; (3) I will attempt to convey the legislative perspective; and (4) in spite of how I sound, I do support the lifelong learning concept.

In recent years there has been much discussion of the lifelong learning concept, and of its overall thesis that learning and research in general will be the major social enterprise of the postindustrial society. This discussion has been sweet music to program planners in institutions of higher education. After 20 years of phenomenal growth in enrollment, faculty, and federal and state expenditures, postsecondary education now faces a problem maintaining its viability in view of future declining enrollments and increasing expenses. There is no question that higher education institutions are threatened by lack of customers.

In Oregon, support for higher education as a whole has increased by 800 percent since 1959-1960 to a figure for the current biennium of $201.4 million. Even more than in the case of the federal government, however, limitations of future expenditures at the state level must be strictly observed. We must realize that the reality of revenue limitations will occur in a future economic environment of great contrast to that of the past. Today it is commonplace to note that, as in the case of population growth, economic growth for better or worse will also undergo a slowdown. To quote Governor Brown, "We must learn to live with less."

Viewing continuing education, I want to list some important facts about education policy with regard to Oregon:

1. Oregon primarily effects policy through the budgeting system. Few legislators review education; the Ways and Means Committee does that.

2. Oregon has built a great deal of autonomy into the system through boards and commissions. There is little legislative or executive influence.

3. Oregon policy can best be described as a nonpolicy. Very little is contained in Oregon statutes regarding education policy.

Prime sponsors of adult and continuing education in Oregon include public schools, community schools, community colleges, public colleges and universities, the Division of Continuing Education (DCE), the Cooperative Extension Service, and many private and independent organizations. With the student losses, all of these institutions are trying to expand their markets.

Continuing education, under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education and Higher Education, is coordinated through formal agreements signed by the community colleges with the Division of Continuing Education and the Cooperative Extension Service. This is not statutory, but rather is a negotiated (i.e., peace) agreement. Adult basic education is the primary responsibility of the community colleges. In areas outside community college districts, which account for 12 percent of our population, public secondary schools have the primary responsibility. Lower division credit courses offered off campus are also the responsibility of community colleges. Outside their districts, responsibility falls to the state system through the Division of Continuing Education. Vocational and technical work offered off campus is the responsibility of the community colleges, except for activities historically within the purview of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Regarding funding policies, the system as it has evolved is neither comprehensive nor consistent. Funding varies widely, depending on institution or segment, whether the course is off campus or on campus, and the nature of the educational offering. Similarly, student charges for attending adult and continuing education programs differ substantially, depending on the type of program and the mix of available government and private resources. Within the state system, for example, fees range from no charge for cooperative extension courses to virtually full cost for courses offered by the Division of Continuing Education.

Community colleges have been allowed to break down their walls and receive state reimbursement for a broad range of courses open to adults, including academic transfer and vocational courses. Hobby and recreational courses are ineligible for reimbursement and are offered on a self-supporting basis or with support from local property taxes. Community colleges are reimbursed at the same rate for courses taught on campus as for off campus. For this reason, community colleges can view their entire district as their campus, and many do. Their only limitation to reimbursement is a statutory prohibition against receiving more support than the difference between operating expenses and the sum of resident student fees and vocational funds. They also receive a fixed amount of full-time enrollment reimbursement. Eight of the last 12 years have seen supplemental funds as enrollments exceeded projections.

Viewing the state system, Oregon has moved backward. The Division of Continuing Education is solely responsible for planning and administering off-campus instruction on a totally self-supporting basis. This self-support policy has had the effect of either forcing DCE to offer courses in outlying areas at a net operating loss or to eliminate them. DCE's volume of activity has been reduced by $1.6 million over the past five years. Its client groups include private organizations, such as banks and business associations, which contract for services; public agencies, such as public school districts and the criminal corrections division seeking in-service training for their employees; individuals seeking transfer credit; and the general public through lecture series and seminars.

The legislature has been accused of forcing education into the front-end load model, a step backward; in reality, however, the DCE funding decision was made by two legislators. Nearly everyone recognizes that DCE is not the best way to handle the problem of statewide access. A program implemented in 1974 permits state colleges and universities to offer off-campus reimbursable upper division and graduate courses, or continuing education, on an in-load basis, but only so long as legislatively budgeted enrollment levels are not exceeded. Participation in this program has dropped off this year, as problems of underenrollment at Portland State University and the Oregon College of Education have eased.

One might rightly ask just who is stepping backward in education? Oregon schools have the administrative authority to offer continuing education with state dollars, but they will not do so as long as enrollments are stable. Now, in 1976, the state system is beginning to realize that DCE should be restructured and that each school should be given some latitude in offering off-campus instruction. My point is that the educational establishment can set priorities with the dollars they receive.

In spite of a lack of policy, or perhaps because of it, Oregon has an extensive continuing education system. This year, community college enrollment stands at 44,000 FTE students. Two-thirds of this number comes from outside the traditional 18- to 22-year-old age group. Unlike the the declining growth projections for the state system, enrollment in community colleges will continue to grow, though at slower than historical rates. It is interesting to observe that, in 1960, Oregon's community college enrollment was only 219. Even more impressive than this rate of growth within the community colleges is the fact that nearly one-third of Oregon's adult population participates in continuing education. National studies put adult participation in postsecondary education at between 25 and 31 percent. From this we can infer that the market for these services--if not glutted--is at least reaching a saturation point.

The principal policy questions that will face administrators of higher education and legislators alike will, therefore, not be extending their commitment to adult and continuing education, but improving the efficiency and quality of service delivery. The first need in this area, at least in Oregon, is redeveloping the law as it addresses this subject in the very basic area of definitions. Oregon law contains no comprehensive definition of adult and continuing education, although most activities are authorized in five sections of existing statutes. Where should the emphasis on continuing education be placed? What should and should not be funded? Who should pay? The first and most obvious need is to assure equal opportunity for all citizens in diverse geographical areas. An active teacher in Portland could get a master's degree for $950; in the small community of Burns, the degree would cost $1,800. Part-time students who live in communities that have state-system schools can attend with a state subsidy. But those who live farther away must pay the full cost for courses offered through DCE.

We also need to address the question of providing special funding for rural continuing education not covered under services offered by the Cooperative Extension Service. Such a plan will help upgrade the rural environment, bringing many beneficial effects that, to date, have not been sufficiently addressed in public policy. A second question that continually confuses this issue is whether continuing education should be oriented toward job or personal interests. From the standpoint of revenue limitations, the state most clearly emphasizes job- and career-related activities. But the limitations of career education must also be recognized. The pace of change in society will sentence to obsolescence many existing careers within the lifetime of many workers. Moreover, skepticism should be directed to whether there will be enough future economic growth to comfortably absorb the baby-boom generation labor force, as well as increasing numbers of women and minorities who rightfully wish a more central role in the American economy. We may find for this reason that continuing education courses such as rug making, gourmet cooking, or even belly dancing that today would be considered inappropriate for career-oriented reimbursement, may in coming years offer unsuspected career opportunities in an evolving American economy.

It is time not only for a departure from the "front-end load model" of higher education, a departure from the emphasis on the 18- to 22-year-old campus student body, but, admissions policies, financial aid policies, and evening course offerings should be expanded within existing resources to accommodate the adult part-time student who will be the major client for services for the forseeable future. The concept of the lifelong learning society involves more than an ever-enlarging educational edifice dispensing knowledge and skills to a relatively passive recipient population. The phenomenal success of community colleges over the past dozen years must be attributed to their responsiveness and flexibility to the changing needs of students increasingly oriented toward the lifetime relevancy of their courses of study.

The future success or failure of higher education must be gauged against a similar standard, only in your case writ large. Historically, public policy and support has followed the needs and interests of higher education. But it is becoming increasingly clear that, if higher education is to flourish in the era of limits, its interests must coincide with the broadly interpreted needs of public policy. Now we know the problem. I want some help!

This brings me to the key problem facing education: deteriorating legislative support. There are 90 legislators in Oregon. I contend that 90 legislators wholeheartedly support the expenditure of public funds for education. Why, then, is it so difficult to obtain funding? I contend that the education establishment has lost its initiative for innovation and change. During the expansion years, new programs were no problem, as additions could be easily made. But recently, public institutions have found it difficult, if not impossible, to innovate in their steady-state systems. In Oregon, people have made all the difference. I will go even further in my indictment of the education establishment. Oregon education policy at the legislative level has traditionally been resisted by members of the education establishment. They naturally wish to work out their own arrangements. My committee will produce a comprehensive policy toward adult and continuing education for consideration by the next session of the legislature. I predict that the education establishment will resist and possibly prevent the passage of such a policy.

In summary, I believe that the legislature is seen as a more ominous force by educators than it actually is. Try to understand some basic facts about elected officials: they are not well informed; they have very definite biases, usually toward jobs; they usually find negative action is much easier; and there are few political payoffs in education. Thus I conclude that the legislature is dependent upon the education establishment for its policy directions.

George J. Nolfi
President
University Consultants, Inc.

George Nolfi is an independent public policy analyst who is currently serving as president of University Consultants, Inc., which he founded. He has served as a consultant to and performed studies for a wide variety of federal and state agencies and numerous private organizations on various matters of education and manpower policy.

Good Reasons for Expanded Public Investment

Presented here are several perspectives on the problem of financing the continued education of adults, plus several policy and program alternatives for such public investment. There are compelling reasons for public subsidy, yet there is a persistent problem in that the perspective adopted by educators advocating such funding is too narrow to be convincing. Usually, consideration of what already exists (how it is financed and what the true gaps are in terms of a need for social policy in public investment) is inadequate. Many advocates have not done their homework and appear to legislators as engaging in special pleading for their favorite project. Modest analysis from a broader social needs perspective reveals several facts that make the case for public policy and investment in open learning.

Educators must alter their current perspective in two ways if the case for financing extended learning is to be made. (1) In order to answer the sensible, reasonable questions that legislators often raise, and to convince them, it is crucial to expand our perspective far broader than the traditional degree-granting college sector. We must think more in terms of an "open-learning universe" that includes proprietary schools, employer-based training, and so on. (2) Educators must broaden their perspective and think in terms of general social needs. The days of arguing the intrinsic benefits of education are gone. The payoff from educational investments made at the state or federal level, in terms of other social problems and needs that exist, must be delineated.

Public Investment in Open Learning

Open learning has tremendous potential to assist in future social and economic progress in America. Its promise is obvious from the statistics of the number of adults returning to school or the excitement of specific experiments. It can be the new opportunity for access to education, training, and social mobility by disadvantaged groups in society. It can provide education for those who missed the chance in their youth and now lack not the will but the time, money, self-confidence, or geographic proximity for learning. It can provide midcareer retraining for those buffeted by technological shifts in the economy. Finally, it can be a force for revitalizing America's cultural and humanistic traditions and the promise for all citizens to pursue their potential to the maximum.

Because open learning will have larger social implications, and because the realization of its potential will depend on who attends, what they learn, and how they study, public policies and investments to shape its scope and direction must be carefully considered at the federal and state levels.

Public policies and investment in open learning research and experimentation should be derived from social needs to alleviate social dependency, improve the manpower skills base, and deal with labor market shifts and unemployment.

The first priority for federal action should be to encourage the extension of access to adult open learning for currently underserved clienteles. The most striking and troublesome fact about the existing pattern of adult open learning is the virtual exclusion of lower income, occupation, and education groups. The evidence is clear that their desire to learn is high, as is their willingness to pay, but the responsiveness of the education system has been modest. Barriers such as cost, poor information, previous low grades, red tape, lack of transportation, and curricula irrelevant to their nonprofessional occupational needs exist. The current wave of open learning innovation in the academic community has failed to overcome these barriers. Open learning's current clientele is primarily adults of higher income, job status, and previous educational attainment. Many receive subsidies (e.g., from employers) or direct salary increments exceeding their investment in open learning and hardly need further assistance.

Two groups in particular must be reached through new modes of service delivery--the "disadvantaged" and the "second-chance" clienteles. The disadvantaged will require expanded programs in remedial education, counseling, job placement, and financial aid. Second-chance clienteles have many skills developed on the job or in noncredit learning settings and need certification of skills and means to convert their nontraditional learning into credit. The former group is likely to be more costly on a per capita basis but constitutes the highest social priority; the latter constitutes a cost-effective priority.

Most innovations by educational entrepreneurs start from the perspective of the teaching-learning mode itself rather than from a clear perception of client need; as such, they often fail to consider whether this new approach will meet the needs of currently underserved clienteles or simply of those types of adults already served.

The current uncoordinated development process driven by the initiatives of professional educators might, if unaltered, lead to the following unfortunate result: not only will an elite group of students receive the best education as youths, but it will be the only group that will continue to receive upgrading and further learning as adults. The existing system of continuing education and open learning is serving selected "elite" clienteles, and is thus acting to widen rather than reduce the gap between adults who are at the upper end of the socioeconomic scale and those who are at the lower end.

The second priority should be to ensure that new investments in open learning build upon existing resources. A number of formal and nontraditional options are now available to adults. Enrollments in the "adult open learning universe" are at colleges and universities (25 percent), proprietary schools (28 percent), on-the-job training or union-based programs (27 percent), community classes (13 percent), correspondence classes (8 percent), and private centers and instruction (10 percent). Part-time study and a consumer-centered "learning market" characterize this open learning universe in marked contrast to traditional full-time higher education. Public investment should build upon and strengthen this system in a selective fashion, not duplicate or replace it. Many of the characteristics of new "nontraditional" open learning initiatives in higher education were developed long ago in other sectors. Moreover, most of the contribution of traditional higher education has come through extension programs, with the recent high-profile nontraditional innovations accounting for less than 1 percent of the total adult open learning activity.

In practical terms, this means that an investment strategy to expand American open learning should be selective, explicit, and cost effective. Definitions of labor market and economic and social goals should be precisely drawn, and policies should be targeted where there is the greatest need and opportunity for leverage. Research and development should be directed at broad social needs (not at esoteric educational innovation reflecting the whims of education professionals), and at innovations that can be easily disseminated and adapted in a variety of diverse settings. Finally, evaluations should be built into each project to ensure that the link with social objectives and client needs is made and measured after the fact.

The third priority is to adopt a "consumer's point of view" in designing open learning. Research and experimentation should be attuned to social priorities and client needs rather than the needs and goals of institutions and education professionals. Too often, support is given to institutions to develop programs, which, in the end, have little relevance to the student. The prime focus of strategies to stimulate open learning should be on students who need financial aid and on services specifically tied to their educational styles and needs. Such an approach will lead to institutional diversity and to responsiveness to labor market and economic and social dependency needs.

Whether open learning over time will remain an elitist institution in our society, or whether it will effectively serve the wide range of nontraditional students who need it most, depends primarily on the nature of the initiatives undertaken in student subsidy mechanisms, in teaching-learning modes and delivery systems, and in educational and career counseling systems over the next few years. Such initiatives need not always be dramatic or extensive in character. Research indicates that adult learners prefer direct student subsidies allowing them to make their own educational decisions rather than institutional subsidies to only public institutions. They also prefer traditional learning formats (involving meeting with an instructor and other students) offered at convenient times and places, and want counseling that relates education and careers.

Policy Issues for Debate

Equity, efficiency and effectiveness, innovation and diversity, and feasibility are four basic areas of concern underlying financing considerations. How a policy will affect these four concerns depends on decisions made about what and who will be subsidized, how the funds will be raised, and exactly how they will be distributed and administered.

Given limited funds, a choice must be made about the allocation of those funds to a variety of activities. Should all credit activities be funded automatically? How should funds be distributed over noncredit activities that may be more related to career needs than certain credit activities? Obviously, some noncredit activities might merit subsidy, yet the size of the recreational educational activity in proprietary schools and in other organizations shows a high degree of willingness by individuals to pay for these types of activities. What about noncollegiate activities in various types of providers? Should various ancillary services such as counseling be subsidized or placed on a fee basis? Is it necessary to invest new capital facilities such as media?

Consideration of these choices is difficult. How should the potential conflict between the funding of full-time versus part-time versus nontraditional versus noncollegiate activities be dealt with, all of which in various ways can contribute to extended learning opportunities for adults? What sort of record keeping will be necessary? How influential should relative cost be (should the base for funding be the lowest cost that can be demonstrated)? Should only job-related activities be funded in those areas where there are skilled manpower shortages in the local economy? Finally, at what level (remedial to postgraduate) should priority for the use of the new funds be placed?

Answers to these types of questions can only be developed in the context of specific situations. Space does not permit a detailed review of the conclusions of a comprehensive analysis of these issues in a variety of settings. A statewide master plan study for continuing education and nontraditional study done in Massachusetts in 1973 by me and Valerie Nelson is one reasonably comprehensive analysis of this type.

The decision about a particular clientele for new public investment can be made explicitly or left to whatever patterns of individual ability to utilize a given program emerge. If the latter course is taken, the evidence is compelling that public subsidy will go primarily to upper middle-class, reasonably well-educated, and reasonably high-income adults who currently dominate the population of continuing education and nontraditional study. Such an approach would appear to be contradictory to some of the most fundamental considerations of equity of educational opportunity generally agreed to. Hence, a more explicit policy description of target clienteles is required.

Several considerations are useful in selecting an appropriate target clientele. Who will benefit from the investment and what is the relation of individual benefit to larger social benefit? Who will support the particular targeted strategy politically (an important consideration when one is ready to implement)? Who is willing to pay without subsidy in the existing recurrent education market place? What are the facts with respect to access in the particular situation (e.g., state or substate region)?

Depending upon some of the particular financing mechanisms employed, different groups in the society can be taxed to raise the funds. Considerations of the equity of the American tax system aside, there are still significant differences between the alternatives available (e.g., earmarked payroll taxes as sources of funds versus general tax revenues). The options available for raising the necessary revenue are many, and some are more appropriate for certain purposes than others. Educators should quickly recognize the appropriateness of arguing for subsidies from general tax revenues for adults of lower socioeconomic status, while simultaneously recognize that forced savings plans through individual payroll taxes would be more appropriate for more general subsidy arrangements. For any fund-raising strategy, possible differential roles of state and federal sources should be developed.

The effect of any particular choice of revenue source on the pattern of private investment in recurrent education must also be analyzed. If a particular policy for raising revenues for public expenditure has the effect of curtailing previously existing private investment and no new funds are being added to the overall system, it is merely a redistribution. If, however, revenue sources are tapped, which will have no effect on the existing pattern of private investment, then the aggregate total social investment in recurrent education will increase.

In selecting the method of subsidy, the first consideration should be what needs are inherently best met by a particular approach. Certain approaches will be more responsive to certain objectives by virtue of the particular pattern of incentives and behavior that the approach generates. Analysis of the likely behavioral consequences of educational investment decision alternatives is often overlooked.

In addition, there is a series of conceptual complications ranging from whether or not extended study and open learning for adults should be seen as separate and distinct, or whether unique policies for funding them should be abandoned and a major restructuring of the entire pattern of youth postsecondary and adult continuing nontraditional education be developed.

Moreover, given the necessary and desirable flexibility of new types of institutional arrangements, new funding approaches can be made sufficiently nonrigid so that they do not bias a particular form of provision of educational services. Note, for example, that with the FTE (full-time equivalent) funding process used as a standard throughout much of higher education there are no incentives created for altering the production process or teaching-learning mode. The behavioral incentives for everyone in the system are for maintaining the existing production process and simply generating increased demand. If institutions were funded on a per-graduate basis, for example, the incentives for alternate ways of developing the competencies necessary for graduation besides traditional courses would be great. Such an approach to funding extended degree programs would have advantages over the FTE approach in terms of stimulating diverse teaching and assessment patterns. However, it would still be subject to the inherent imprecision of any uniform and universal subsidy technique as a policy instrument.

If institutional or supply subsidy is the technique selected, there are three choices. Average cost funding may be used through some sort of a formula approach such as FTE. Marginal funding of a particular category (e.g., unemployed workers, those attending a particular institution, or veterans) is also possible, and this permits a fairly precise and efficient supply subsidy, provided institutions find the subsidy to be a sufficiently great incentive to truly identify and respond to the need of the targeted group; that is a big if. Block grants for innovative programs can also be used, and these work well when the objectives of the public investment correspond exactly to those of the recipient of the block grant.

If the alternate strategy of student or demand subsidy is selected, at least two approaches are possible. A particular clientele category can be provided with a base-level (e.g., average cost) subsidy. Alternatively, the target clientele category can be made so narrow that some of the problems of average cost funding are avoided. Also, funding level within a category can be graduated along several dimensions (for example, the Massachusetts Voucher Proposal is contingent upon income, previous education, and actual cost of the educational activity selected and is graduated along all three dimensions).

There are problems with both supply and demand subsidy approaches. In demand subsidies there is always the risk that some individuals will be funded who would have been willing to invest their own money anyway. This can be minimized if the target category is precisely drawn. For supply subsidy, the universal subsidy approaches are both inequitable and inefficient, and even funding at the margin (e.g., by providing a supplemental institutional grant for particular types of individuals recruited) is likely to be inefficient. This is because there is absolutely no incentive for the institution to respond to the particular needs and demands of the clientele. There are clear incentives for the institutions to recruit members of this clientele and put them into some sort of program to obtain the subsidy. Because institutions are stimulated to enroll certain individuals does not at all mean that what the institution enrolls them in is in the client's best interest. However, note the marked contrast between this approach and the alternative of voucher (demand financing) to this same group of individuals. Individuals in the latter case have power to bargain with the institution, and the institution has been presented with a powerful set of incentives to respond to the true needs of this consumer in a better fashion than a neighboring institution.

Hence, for reasons of overall efficiency and for reasons of placing before institutions incentives for increased consumer responsiveness, demand subsidy approaches hold the most promise. Moreover, the entire recurrent education market place operates primarily on a consumer payment model. Hence, demand subsidies here (in marked contrast to the traditional higher education sector or the traditional elementary-secondary education sector), correspond directly to the accustomed pattern of operation. Because demand subsidies should be the primary mode of funding, it does not necessarily follow that they should be the only mode for all activities. Instructional subsidy should be through the demand mode, whereas the provision of counseling and ancillary services should best be handled through supply subsidy approaches.

The Current Situation

The present pattern of financing continuing education, external degrees, open learning experiments, and so on, at both state and national levels is highly varied, experimental, and mostly circumstantial. Usually it has to do with the educational/political environment in a particular state and with the particular patterns of advocacy for certain ideas at certain times.

The situation is further complicated by a series of imprecise terms--adult, continuing, and extension education; nontraditional study; open universities; and lifelong learning. (I prefer the term "recurrent education" because it is broader and more inclusive than the others, and also it is relatively free from the historical biases carried by the others.) This multiplicity of terms confuses the discussion and forces one to "compare apples and oranges" when comparing different financing approaches and practices.

Increasingly, states are examining closely and attempting to rationalize this very complicated, varied, and circumstantial set of financing policies. For example, in Massachusetts an Adult Recurrent Education Entitlement Voucher Program is under consideration by the legislature (H 1712), while Wisconsin recently issued a study suggesting a statutory provision requiring that three policy criteria be considered for all planning and financing of extension or extended study.

Significantly, the funding criteria advocated in these inquiries are not the kinds of criteria typically advocated by educational entrepreneurs or innovators in nontraditional education. The Massachusetts Selective Entitlement Voucher Bill places top priority on selective funding of low-income and previous low-educational attainment adults to utilize existing educational opportunities. For Wisconsin, the three criteria advocated were: (1) that public subsidies be provided to meet public or social needs, and client fees should be set in recognition of client benefits; (2) client ability to pay; and (3) program costs. It is argued that if criteria 1 and 3 are uniformly applied, then comparable programs serving comparable clientele would have comparable fee charges. The Wisconsin report concludes that only when these criteria are combined with an ability-to-pay criterion will an equitable policy result. Clearly, such a policy does not mean a uniform flat-rate low tuition for continuing education courses or extended degree study. Stated the Wisconsin study, "implementation of a uniform fee rate for continuing education courses (in the public sector) would be inequitable and unfeasible." That is a fundamentally important conclusion, reaffirming the rationale behind the Massachusetts Voucher Plan, as articulated in 1973, that continuing education should be paid for by adults who use it and benefit from it according to their ability to pay.

Other attempts to devise reasonable means of support for extended, part-time, or nontraditional study have included: workload adjustments of the FTE formula, distinct comprehensive program support, a service supplement, enrollment quotas, and professional workload measures.

A recent study conducted by the Berkeley Center for Research and Development of Higher Education specifically of extended degrees, noted, "public support for operating costs was limited, although there was variation in approach among the categories. Only one of the four public institutions using the extended-campus approach received significant state aid for its extended degree programs. Only two of the institutions in the liberal studies/adult degree category are public and their programs received about 30 percent of their support from state appropriations. On the other hand, all public institutions in the individualized study category received substantial government funds."

The problem of funding of noncredit activity is also being addressed in many states. Such funding is highly varied, with some states (e.g., Georgia) funding noncredit activity on a continuing education unit basis, some states funding it only in certain institutions through general institutional subsidies, and so forth.

A fundamental issue is involved here because obviously some noncredit activity is more related to certain social objectives (e.g., employing people who are out of jobs) than is some credit activity (which may be taken for purely recreational purposes by a person who is virtually free of major social problems). Hence, the credit-noncredit distinction in funding, while often used, is extremely troublesome in terms of social policy and public investment considerations. A different categorization of activity will have to be developed.

The California Department of Finance noted in a 1976 report that "there is no evidence that the state must provide recreational courses in order to insure a literate and productive society. While these courses are undeniably enjoyable, they must be considered optional, not essential public programs." The report then described what the cost avoidance would be if the state stopped subsidizing recreational types of educational activities.

While not explicitly stated in this report, the logic behind the conclusion is clear and applicable to most states. Most people enrolled in noncredit recreational and personal growth courses tend to be upper middle-class in terms of job status, educational attainment, and income. It is very difficult to justify taxing the population at large to provide a general subsidy for recreational pursuits of that particular group in American society. That is the logic behind the curtailment of such expenditures and it is sensible. A subsidy policy must be derived in a different way.

Options for Public Policy and Investment

There are basically three strategies for public investment in extended study (or more broadly recurrent education); demand subsidies to clientele (the consumers); supply subsidies to the providers of educational services; or block purchase of service arrangements for services needed to solve social problems (e.g., drug abuse funds and law enforcement education funds). One can subsidize the demand side of the equation, the supply side, or selective activities.

Regardless of which subsidy strategy is selected, there are five trade-offs which immediately have to be made (whether in the analysis presented by educators in justifying their funds or in the questions of public officials). (1) Either more students are assisted to study on a part-time basis or fewer students are assisted on a full-time basis, given a limited amount of funds. (2) Either limited resources are diffused over all segments of the population through a universal entitlement such as a flat FTE subsidy or a low-tuition arrangement, or they are focused in a way that targets public investment on those people and those specific activities that need it the most and that will yield the highest social rate of return. (3) Either public funds are used in a manner that replaces existing private investment or so as to leverage, supplement, and encourage private investment. (The manpower programs in the 1960s provide evidence that some of that money from the MDTA Act in 1963 went into supporting training activities that companies would have paid for regardless because they needed the skilled manpower.) (4) Either the funds are diffused over a broad range of totally discretionary activities or they are focused on certain activities (e.g., a job-related criterion) that are deemed to be most important in terms of current social needs. (5) Either more people are assisted with instructional subsidies only or many fewer are provided with income stipends. Various proposals made for the financing of extended study and open learning opportunities for adults will reflect different positions (whether implicit or explicit) on these trade-offs.

The following are mechanisms by which public investment can be made:

- Selective entitlement vouchers for target clienteles having high social priority
- Universal entitlements
- Incentive tax credits for individuals and employers
- Block purchase of educational services and programs of various types by specific groups for various purposes, such purchases being from the variety of providers within the adult open learning universe
- "Bank" or trust fund approaches involving voluntary or forced savings, and credit schemes such as contingent loans
- Subsidies to individuals by employers, unions, and the military for the purchase of educational services
- Long-term general institutional subsidies to various types of open learning service providers
- Financing staff positions
- Financing programs
- Extension of formula funding to part-time and noncredit activities and development of new formulas
- "Venture" financing of specific innovations
- Incentive grants
- Subsidizing specific auxiliary services such as information and counseling

In short, a bewildering array of mechanisms can be applied. In any particular instance, when trying to justify funding for a particular initiative, systematic thinking through of those mechanisms and selection of the type of mechanism that is most suited to make the proposed activity responsive to larger social purposes is necessary but is seldom done. The Adult Recurrent Education Entitlement Voucher Program in Massachusetts resulted from precisely that sort of analysis.

Criteria for an effective and efficient national or state policy for investment in extended learning opportunities for adults and for selecting an optimal financing mechansim: Appropriate subsidy mechanisms should be derived from the particular characteristics of the continuing education system and of the adult clientele. An appropriate mechanism will have the following characteristics: Mature adults should receive a subsidy in a manner that permits them to make their own decisions about how they want to pursue their education. Adults (particularly disadvantaged adults) must be provided with adequate information to permit them to make intelligent decisions. The recurrent and continuing education system presently operates almost entirely in a market mode, and hence the natural responsiveness of that system to the needs of adults will be enhanced through the provision of demand subsidies directly to adult consumers.

Based on four basic concerns of equity, efficiency, innovation and diversity, and feasibility mentioned earlier, six criteria for public investment in extended study can be articulated.

1. Given the current fiscal imperatives and the competition for resources from many worthy causes, particular care should be taken to build upon agencies that already exist and not simply duplicate existing services.

2. Public policies and investment strategies should be selective so as to precisely address those social needs that private investment and the recurrent education system are not spontaneously meeting on their own. Financial aid for adults over 25, of low income and with previous education, and provision of information and counseling services are the main needs.

3. Public policy and investment should deal first with those problems having the greatest social priority and that are manageable in their dimensions. Hence, the first purpose of adult educational entitlements should not be the reform of higher education, but rather the provision of the expanded equality of educational opportunity. Much discussion of entitlement confuses these objectives. This is a manageable problem that can be isolated and treated with a specifically tailored solution.

Thus, while higher education reform, or indeed the reform of the financing of the entire system of education in the country, may be desirable in the long run, large general entitlement proposals that are advocated primarily from that perspective miss the point in terms of social need. Most of the proposals made have not been developed to the point of an operational design that can be implemented. Most can be shown to be clearly regressive, and none deal adequately with the differential access problem for adults with previous low education and income. While education is good for its own sake, new expenditures to provide adult educational entitlement should be directed first at contributing to the solution of various socioeconomic problems faced by specific adult groups. Assisting those who are socially dependent in developing self-sustaining skills, as well as assisting those who lack economically viable skills and job mobility to develop those skills and thereby participate in the labor force, will yield a higher social return.

4. Care must be taken so that new public investment will supplement, and not supplant, existing private expenditures. A vast private investment is made daily in recurrent education. Hence, a serious problem with universal educational entitlements or flat-rate low-tuition subsidies for adult

recurrent education is simply providing public funds to replace private investment that already exists (recall the example of manpower programs in the 1960s). Further, the public investment made should be made in a manner so as to increase the options of choice of individuals beyond those options of choice already made available by private investment.

5. Care must be taken to preserve and strengthen the "learning market" character of the American recurrent education system. This is essential so that the vitality that spontaneously built this consumer responsive "alternative" educational system in which millions of citizens are participating is preserved. The best way to do that is by the subsidy of the consumers--the subsidy of demand rather than the subsidy of supply. A selective entitlement voucher plan such as that proposed in Massachusetts accomplishes this.

6. A state or federal program of educational entitlements for adults should be simply administered (e.g., in a manner such as that detailed in the design documents for the Adult Recurrent Education Entitlement Voucher bill pending in the Massachusetts legislature).

In addition to problems identified earlier, there are some additional complications that characterize the financing of extended study. First, many of the formula-planning approaches (such as FTE, the Georgia continuing education unit approach, or the Wisconsin workload approach) have weaknesses resulting from their imprecision as policy instruments. They are not sufficiently discriminating to accomplish the precise social objectives that characterize the needed selective public intervention in the recurrent education system. Moreover, all tend to homogenize the approaches to the production and delivery of educational services. Educators are often troubled by the necessity to justify nontraditional programs in traditional FTE-formula funding approaches. These pressures inhibit greater diversity.

Second, the stakes, costs, and benefits in expanding adult learning opportunities are very high. This activity should have a substantial claim on public resources. It is difficult to explicitly assign the costs and benefits in a sufficiently simple fashion to present the case adequately. However, it is not entirely necessary to adopt the cost benefit rationale approach. The main utility of such approaches is in choosing between alternative supply subsidy or purchase of service arrangements. To some extent, the question can be bypassed by adopting a market approach that decentralizes the cost benefit investment decision to individual decision makers rather than a public agency. Hence, overall cost benefit analysis becomes less important, and reasonably informed individuals are assumed to make sound investment decisions in terms of their own education, particularly if they are adults and are given a certain amount of counseling. For example, for many adults, it is quite clear what particular educational skills would enable them to advance in their career. This is another reason why demand subsidy has many inherent advantages in recurrent education.

Third, decisions about the amount of public resources to be invested must depend to some extent on the perceived demand and need, yet there is great dispute among analysts about the demand. Some contend that there is a great unmet demand for adult extended learning opportunity. Moreover, analyses show that many of the new extended degree programs are serving upper middle-class clienteles, and while the demand appears the greatest (in social terms) among low-socioeconomic groups, relatively little of the current wave of innovation in extended study is meeting these needs.

But there are also analysts who contend that the anticipated demand will never be realized. In a 1976 article in Change, Herbert London contended that the external degree program of the University of California was ended since the anticipated interest in it never materialized. A similar contention has been made about an extensive program for educational opportunities for the elderly in New York State.

No definitive answer to the question is possible, but the weight of evidence lies in the direction of substantial latent demand for expanded learning opportunities for adults. Generalized aggregate discussions about this demand are insufficient, as it is highly multifaceted and as it is responsive in a highly selective fashion to different types of initiatives.

A fourth complication is illustrated by the problem of benefits assessment. In the area of educational technology, for example, research clearly indicates that there is no significant difference in cognitive outcomes as a function of mediated or traditional modes of instruction. Rationally, therefore, the focus for comparison should be on cost and on the issue of real increases in productivity. However, educators demonstrate a strong disposition for higher cost video techniques rather than lower cost audio and other mediated forms of instruction. A clear trade-off exists between high-cost and low-cost approaches to the uses of educational technology.

In addition, the benefits of education are both cognitive and noncognitive, and there is some evidence that the noncognitive results may be the most significant. However, in much of the extended study movement, the focus is on the cognitive outcomes alone. Virtually the entire discussion of equivalency rests on the cognitive outcomes. Another way of interpreting this argument is to see it as a statement by educators that the noncognitive outcomes are in fact not as important as has been argued. If it is the competencies attained in cognitive terms, rather than the process through which one has gone, that is important, then what has happened to the implied importance of spending four years of time in a particular setting, an importance based on the presumption of highly valuable noncognitive outcomes?

A final crucial point is that the extended study movement in America has not adequately addressed the dual concerns of clientele and of cost advantage. Many initiatives are serving the same types of clientele who are already receiving adequate service, and few initiatives are truly directed at lowering the cost of the educational process. These two items must be high on the agenda of the extended study movement in the future.

Recommendations

Considering the rationale for public support and the criteria for an effective, efficient policy suggested above, I believe that public policy should be that continuing education should be paid for by the individuals who benefit from it according to their ability to pay. Low-income, low previous education adults, however, should be subsidized, for they are not able to pay and society will benefit in the long run from their education. These are from specific immediate needs for public policy and investment.

Extended Degree Programs--Part of a Larger Picture of Continuing Education

Ralph D. Mills and Charles Steensland

The presenters in this session examined the relationship of extended degree programs to the educational services offered through continuing or adult education. They focused on service to the student as the "consumer of education." In addition, they identified problems related to extended degree programs and proposed tentative solutions.

Ralph D. Mills
State University Dean
  of Continuing Education
California State University and Colleges

Ralph Mills has administrative responsibility for developing and for providing leadership in the areas of extension, summer session, and programs contributing to lifelong learning, and for providing overall coordination of these programs at the 19 campuses of the California State University and Colleges system. He also has various other responsibilities related to continuing education.

The changing needs of our society have placed considerable stress upon all institutions, including institutions of higher education. The university is being called upon to be more responsive to the requirements of today. Yet, by tradition and by reputation, the university, like most other institutions, is slow to accommodate change. Even when change comes slowly, many academicians are not altogether comfortable with it.

Concerning the evolution of the university from its beginnings, Clark Kerr made the following observation:

> The university started as a single community--a community of masters and students. It may even be said to nave had a soul in the sense of a central animating principle. Today the large American university is, rather, a whole series of communities and activities held together by a common name, a common governing board, and related purposes. This great transformation is regretted by some, accepted by many, gloried in, as yet, by few.

Although the university has changed since its medieval beginnings, still these changes have not much affected the university's basic sense of purpose or the way it conducts its basic business. These have not changed much in the last half-millenium. Its governing board, administration, faculty, and curricula remain dedicated to providing degree-earning opportunities primarily for younger adults. These opportunities are still, as they have been for centuries, available primarily to those who are able to come to the university's traditional place of business--the campus--during the university's traditional business hours (as defined by class schedules and academic calendars).

In recent years, however, the university has been under growing pressure to provide degree-earning opportunities in places and at times more convenient for older adults. These individuals felt the need for such opportunities. But they found it inconvenient or impossible to do business with the university in the traditional manner. And the American university, bound by traditional attitudes and assumptions about how it conducts its business, has not been uniformly responsive to the call for extended degree programs. There have been exceptions, however. Some university leaders--boards, administrators, and faculty--have recognized the need to redesign and revitalize the university to make it more accessible and more responsive to the changing educational needs of society. They have acted creatively to overcome traditional resistance to change--with something more than glacial speed. A particularly good example of this process in action is afforded by the development of the External Degree program of the California State University and Colleges (CSUC), which constitutes one of the largest educational bureaucracies in the world. At the same time, this example will illustrate how CSUC's Continuing Education program served as the policy instrument for extending degree-earning opportunities beyond the campus into the community and for expanding the traditional concept of the university.

This process began in January 1971 when Chancellor Dumke sought and received the endorsement of the Board of Trustees for his proposal to effect fundamental changes in the (then) California State Colleges' approach to higher education. In his statement to the Board, the chancellor spoke of the need to provide "degree opportunities for substantial numbers of students other than through an on-campus program for students in residence--students whom under our present rigid systems, we cannot hope to serve." The chancellor took a significant step toward this objective in April 1971 when he established a Commission on External Degree Programs. He charged the commission to advise him on how degree-earning opportunities might be made available to students not being served by traditional on-campus programs. Appointed to the commission were two of the system's 19 campus presidents (one of whom was designated chairman), 2 representatives of the chancellor's staff, and 2 faculty members nominated by the Executive Committee of the Systemwide Academic Senate. There was no conscious effort to include representatives of continuing education among the original appointments. (Though I was among those originally appointed, and was, at that time, dean for Continuing Education at California State University, Chico, I was nominated by the Senate's Executive Committee to represent faculty, not by continuing education.)

The commission's recommendation that continuing education be assigned responsibility for extending the university's degree programs came about only after all the available options had been explored and, for one reason or another, the others had been eliminated. State funding was not available to underwrite the cost of a new special purpose institution, or even a new administrative unit to oversee the development of an extended degree program.

Nor were funds available for such purposes from federal agencies or private foundations. Regular campus courses could not be offered in off-campus locations. At that time, board policy prohibited the offering of state-supported instruction off campus for the benefit of off-campus students. The only vehicles available for the delivery of an external degree program were the self-supporting extension and summer session courses administered through the Continuing Education program. Two additional points favoring the designation of continuing education as the administrative vehicle for external degree programs were: (1) the existence of a Systemwide Continuing Education Program Development Fund, and (2) the absence of any other visible source of operating funds for the Commission on External Degree Programs. Hence, by the process of elimination, the commission arrived at the following recommendation: continuing education should become the delivery vehicle for external degree programs.

To provide more effective communication with the campus deans of Continuing Education, a second dean was appointed to the commission. The commission was provided an operating budget from the Systemwide Continuing Education Program Development Fund, and an executive secretary was hired to provide the commission with staff support. Immediately, we began to consider possible barriers to the implementation of external degree programs through continuing education.

We soon determined that if CSUC were going to have an external degree program, it would be necessary to accomplish the following objectives: (1) remove academic policy barriers to external degree program development and delivery, (2) establish greater fiscal flexibility within continuing education to accommodate external degree program operations, (3) establish policies and procedures to guarantee the academic quality of external degree programs, and (4) gain acceptance for the external degree program concept among campus administrators and faculty. These objectives were interrelating and overlapping, and we recognized that we would have to pursue them concurrently. Nevertheless, these objectives and others were realized, for the most part, in the period between July 1971 and March 1972.

The objective that dominated much--perhaps most--of the commission's attention in the earliest months of operation was to alleviate campus and faculty concerns about the concept of the extended degree. Those campuses that were faced with the fear, or the fact, of declining enrollments in on-campus programs were particularly concerned. They wanted no competition for the available students. Some faculty saw in the self-supporting external degree program a plot to introduce tuition into the regular program--through the back door. Still others were genuinely concerned about whether the quality of academic programs could be maintained in off-campus locations on a self-supporting basis. The commission quickly developed a healthy sensitivity to these concerns and began to provide responses.

To gain even better contact with the grass roots, we decided to hold open two-day meetings on a different campus each month, to announce these meetings in advance, and to devote part of each meeting to open discussions with campus administrators and faculty. The commission was undaunted by the fact that 19 months would be required to complete its grand tour of the system's 19 campuses. Efforts were made to be responsive to campus and faculty concerns and to keep faculty and administrators at all levels as fully informed as possible. Commissioners, individually and together, attended campus Academic Senate meetings, meetings of the Systemwide Academic Senate, statewide meetings of the deans of Continuing Education and meetings of the chancellor's Council of Presidents.

Finally, in the event that some bases were not being touched, we developed extensive systemwide mailing lists for our meeting agendas and minutes. At one time, the commission was accused, somewhat facetiously, of running a more effective paper mill than the system's central office. These efforts played a significant role in allaying concerns about the concept of the external degree and the role continuing education would play in administering the program. In the meantime, we were recommending policy changes designed to give continuing education the flexibility to carry out its external degree program mission.

Among the problems in continuing education were system regulations limiting the number of units earned in the Extension Degree program that could be used to satisfy degree requirements: not more than 24 semester units could be used in a baccalaureate program and not more than 6 semester units in a master's program. On the basis of the commission's recommendation, the chancellor sought and received trustee authorization to exclude credits earned in extension courses offered in external degree programs from these limitations. A second defect in continuing education had to do with extension course fees, then established annually by the board. We recognized that, if the academic quality of the external degree program was to be assured, it would be necessary to charge higher fees than were usually charged for extension courses, and in addition, other types of fees, such as the application for admission fee. The additional revenues generated by the higher fees would be utilized in a variety of ways. To make it possible for regular faculty to teach in external degree programs as part of their normal 12-semester unit teaching load, continuing education would have to reimburse the campus' general fund budget for the faculty member's time. Each external program would need a *paid* coordinator, and student and academic support services would have to be provided for off-campus students and paid for from program revenues.

Appropriate recommendations were presented to the chancellor and through him to the trustees. The trustees reacted by delegating to the chancellor authority to establish fees, as necessary, to ensure the fiscal viability and academic quality of these new programs. Another of Continuing Education's defects was thus removed. At the same time we were trying to remove old policy barriers, we were busily drafting some *new* policies and procedures. These were designed to ensure the academic quality of external degree programs and to provide guidance for campuses desiring to develop program proposals.

As these policies and procedures were developed, they were reviewed with the Systemwide Academic Senate and the chancellor's Council of Presidents, before being presented to the chancellor for staff review and final approval. In summer 1972, these policies and procedures were put into a single document and issued by the chancellor's office as the *Manual of Policies and Procedures for Preparation of Proposals and of External Degree*

Programs. The original issue contained "everything anyone in the California State University and Colleges ever wanted to know about external degree programs, but was afraid to ask." Between its covers was the following description:

> A description of procedures the Commission would use in acting on proposals for external degree programs; criteria by which the proposals would be judged; guidelines for implementation of Trustee regulations on fees, residence credit, and establishment of new majors; a catalog of possible categories or models of feasible external degree programs; evaluation guidelines; general information; and an example of a proposal for an external degree program which the Commission already had approved.

Because space prohibits a detailed review of the manual's contents, I will mention a few requirements that have established the character of the external degree programs offered by the California State University and Colleges System:

1. Instruction is offered only at upper division or graduate levels. It is felt that California's extensive network of community colleges provides almost universal access to lower division instruction.
2. All programs are proposed and approved for a pilot period.
3. All proposals are developed and approved through established campus procedures and presented (in person) by campus personnel to the Commission for its review and recommendation to the chancellor.
4. Regular faculty of the campus provide instruction in the program and are responsible for the maintenance of program quality. Use of adjunct or part-time faculty must be approved in accordance with established campus procedures.
5. Each program proposal has an evaluation component and a program evaluator not otherwise involved with the program. An annual evaluation report is submitted to the Commission for its review and comment.
6. The program proposal provides information concerning the need for the program, where the program will be offered, the proposed course of study, steps taken to ensure academic quality, faculty utilization, proposed program fees, and the program budget.

Because external programs are self-supporting, they can be implemented without respect to the availability of state funding. This is not the case with regular on-campus programs. The funds required to support regular programs must be asked for by the trustees in their annual budget request to the governor. The regular academic master planning process requires that the trustees approve all new degree programs. To facilitate implementation of self-supporting degree programs, the trustees authorized Chancellor Dumke to approve them. This change has been particularly significant. It has made possible in most cases a response to identified degree program needs in a timely fashion; and provision of a degree opportunity for May Ann Applebaum and for D. David Glystermyer, as well as "estimated enrollments."

With some of its faults removed, how has continuing education responded to its new mission? One program was operating in 1971-1972--a bachelor's program in public administration, offered by CSU, Chico, in Redding, a city 75 miles north of the campus. About 35 students were enrolled. By fall 1975, the system enrolled 3,733 students in 41 external degree programs. These programs were being offered in urban and rural communities by 13 of the system's 19 campuses. Three additional campuses were cooperating in the delivery of programs offered by sister campuses. The Consortium of the California State University and Colleges, the system's newest and most recently accredited degree-granting entity, offered six degree programs in 29 locations throughout the state. Degree programs in 17 major academic areas are available to students who, for whatever reasons, are unable to participate in regular, on-campus programs. And in 1976-1977, if predictions hold, the number of external degree programs offered by the system will grow to 60, and some of those continuing in operation will serve additional students.

But program totals and enrollment figures, alone, say little about how well continuing education has responded to its new responsibilities. What about student reactions? What about the faculty view of these programs, about which they once harbored significant doubts? The following statement represents a distillation of the annual reports provided to the Commission on External Degree Programs by individual program evaluators. It is taken from the annual report on the evaluation of pilot external degree programs presented to the Board of Trustees in May 1976:

> Generally, students are pleased with these programs and the opportunities afforded to continue their education. They are laudatory in their comments on the quality of instruction, the scheduling and location of classes. They generally evaluated their learning experiences at levels similar to, or higher than, that of students in similar on-campus programs. There was no significant difference between their academic performance and that of students in comparable on-campus programs (as measured by course grades and GPA's). The graduation requirements for external degree programs are as stringent as for on-campus programs. And 95 percent of all students enrolled are working toward degrees.

The following statement about faculty attitudes is taken from the same sources:

> Faculty and staff associated with pilot external degree programs consider the quality of these programs and the students to be comparable to that of on-campus programs. In many cases they consider students in external degree programs to be harder working and more determined than students in on-campus programs. Many of the faculty who have taught classes in external degree programs have

> stated a preference for teaching there, largely because of the more mature and experienced student body. Several of them have expressed the view that their teaching in other courses has been improved because of their experience in external degree program classes.

Since 1971, and without the benefit of state support, continuing education has been demonstrating that degree programs of high quality can be delivered in off-campus locations. This demonstration has been persuasive with the faculty, the administration, and the Board of Trustees. In May 1973, the board authorized establishment of the Consortium of the California State University and Colleges as a separate degree-granting entity of the system. The consortium was charged with utilizing the combined resources of the system to offer degree programs on a regional and statewide basis. Its purpose was to meet the educational needs of students not being served by the programs offered by the individual campuses.

As early as March 1974, the board relaxed its prohibition against state-supported off-campus instruction and permitted a limited number of courses to be offered experimentally. In July 1975, the board took another significant step toward a new policy in this area. It established the Trustees' Task Force on Off-Campus Instruction to review its existing policy and all related issues and to report its findings and recommendations to the board. It is worth noting that this task force had among its members representatives of all the constituencies within the academic community. The report of the task force was submitted to the board in September 1975. In succeeding months, the problems, issues, and recommendations reflected in this report were subjected to further study. Finally, in May 1976, the board adopted a resolution which, in effect, endorsed the basic recommendations of its task force. In adopting this resolution, the board endorsed the offering of a state-supported, degree-oriented instruction in off-campus locations, with the understanding that the academic standards of the system would be maintained and that adequate budgetary resources would be available for the support of such offerings. Further, the board requested the chancellor to "review current and possible future off-campus instructional activity and develop appropriate funding alternatives" for its consideration in connection with future budgets of CSUC.

About five and one-half years elapsed between January 1971 when the chancellor called for expanded access to degree-earning opportunities in off-campus locations, and May 1976 when the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution making the concept of the expanded university systemwide policy. In the future, the CSUC system will provide degree-oriented instruction off campus as well as on campus. The time and place of such instruction will no longer be determined exclusively by university tradition and custom; now the needs and circumstances of off-campus students will be taken into account. This change is fundamental. It was accomplished, with minor exceptions, without financial support from either state, federal, or private foundation sources. This was possible because the system was able to call upon the financial resources and the administrative expertise of its own self-supporting continuing education programs. But the existence of these resources provided only the means for effecting this change. In the final analysis, the change was accomplished because the leadership of the system--

as represented by the board, by campus and systemwide administrators and by the faculty--was responsive to the call for change. They were willing to cooperate in the effort to determine whether degree programs could be delivered effectively in off-campus locations.

I want to stress two points before I conclude. The first is that, by embracing the concept of the expanded university, CSUC demonstrates that the American university, however large or complex, can be responsive to the changing educational needs of society. This demonstrates, also, that the process of institutional change requires those responsible for the broad aims and policies of the university to provide effective leadership. The second point is that the CSUC program of continuing education has experienced little difficulty in carrying out its mandate to make degree-earning opportunities more accessible to students not being served by traditional on-campus programs. This is because of the difference in the way the university and the university's continuing education program have defined their primary business, at least operationally.

The traditional university narrowly defines its business as being to provide on-campus instruction leading to undergraduate or graduate degrees. When the student leaves campus with a degree in hand, the basic business transaction between the student and the traditional university is complete. Educating the individual beyond the degree, to the extent that this is recognized as the business of the university at all, has traditionally been regarded as a subculture within the university community. Like the automobile industry, the traditional university is dedicated almost exclusively to turning out a product. Neither has demonstrated much interest in "servicing" its "product" once it leaves the "plant."

Ironically, while demand for campus-based degree programs is declining, demand for the educational resources available in the traditional university is growing significantly. This is due, in part, to the declining "half-life" of many professional and technical degrees held by university graduates. The typical continuing education program defines its business rather broadly. Its business is to provide students access to the educational resources of the university at a time, and in a place and manner most responsive to student needs and circumstances. Thus, the extended degree program fits naturally into the total spectrum of university resources delivered to students through continuing education. It adds to continuing education's capacity to respond to student need for access to a degree-earning opportunity. When the traditional university makes the decision to conduct its business in off-campus locations, it takes a significant step toward broadening the definition of its business in terms well understood by those involved in continuing education.

Charles Steensland
Program Coordinator
Region VIII, Human Resources
Management Program
University of Utah

Charles Steensland has had extensive experience in manpower programs. He has held administrative and teaching positions in education at all levels, elementary through graduate.

The State of Washington Council on Higher Education has defined the external or extended degree programs as "a series of educational experiences possessing all of the following characteristics: (1) meets the needs of persons who are unable or unwilling to spend extensive time on campus; (2) most learning occurs in locations geographically external to the major portion of the campus facilities; (3) designed to meet one or more of the following objectives: degree, license, diploma, certification, or attainment of specified program goals; and (4) integrated program of generally 12 credit hours or more." The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California has defined the extended degree program as "a degree program with policies and procedures which enhance its convenience and appeal and with content of interest to students who are usually beyond what has been considered the conventional college age." Regardless of the terminology used, the challenge--as I see it--is to take educational programs to the consumer of education and provide flexible programs designed to meet individual needs.

Region VIII--Model Educational Programs

The University of Utah Human Resources Institute is under contract with the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (ETA) to research and design model educational programs in Human Resource Management (HRM). The programs will be designed to serve all ETA-funded employees in the Region VIII states of Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Utah. These states are all rural in nature and share the common problem of a large geographic area and sparse population.

The programs are to be designed to offer external alternative education opportunities throughout the Region VIII states. Credit will be offered for experiential learning, independent study, extension courses, self-paced instruction, multimedia courses, correspondence, regional training center seminars and workshops, credit be exam, and group study. A consortium of Region VIII higher education institutions will be developed to offer a flexible curriculum with a variety of educational alternatives. Key institutions have been identified in each state to allow students to receive the HRM bachelor's degree in the state that they live in. The curricular design will use the existing core curriculum and approved degree programs with selected courses leading to a degree in HRM.

Region VIII--State Survey on the Relationship of Extended Degree Programs to Adult and Continuing Education

Prior to the WICHE conference on extended degrees, the following questions were asked concerning the relationship of extended degree programs to existing programs in adult and continuing education. The questions were directed to the director or administrator of the adult education program in major universities throughout the Region VIII states.

1. Should extended degree programs be considered primarily a function of continuing education?

2. Are there valid arguments for operating extended degree programs through other than the continuing education function of institutions?

3. What are optimum relationships between extended degree programs and other types of special educational services frequently provided through continuing education operations?

4. What are or would be optimal relationships among continuing education, the standard on campus in class instructional operation, and extended degree programs?

5. Do clients tend to see a difference between extended degree programs and other types of continuing education services?

I have summarized the responses to each of these questions on a statewide basis. The objective of the survey was to establish what relationships exist between adult education and extended degree programs, what could be done to improve the relationship, and how clients perceive extended degree programs.

Colorado

Colorado offers an extensive variety of extended degree programs throughout the state and around the world. Extended degree programs are available from the associate in arts to the doctorate level. The five issues in summary form listed above describe some of the existing programs and questions related to extended degree programs.

Question 1. The continuing education role should be to coordinate, keep records, and make arrangements for logistical coordination of extended degree programs. The academic college role is to instruct, advise students, and control content or curriculum in extended degree programs.

Question 2. The arguments for academic involvement are concerned with quality programs, high standards, content specialists, and ability to advise students.

Question 3. The best relationship would provide for coordination and communication between adult and continuing education and extended degree programs.

Question 4. In addition to concerns expressed in the third question, a special need exists for adult counselors to work with continuing education students. Many adult students are concerned with midcareer change, career information, and job opportunities following graduation.

Question 5. Students enrolled in extended degree programs want the same quality and degree status offered in regular degree programs. Regular credit is preferred to extension credit.

Montana

Question 1. Montana has just begun its first extended degree program in public administration. The program is offered through the academic departments involved in granting the degree.

Question 2. At present, only credit classes are offered through continuing education. No provision has been made to offer extended degree programs through continuing education.

Question 3. No experience on which to base an opinion at this time.

Question 4. No data on which to base an opinion.

Question 5. Not applicable at this time.

North Dakota

Question 1. The extended degree programs in North Dakota are currently offered through the college directly involved. A recommendation has been proposed to have the continuing education department assume responsibility for budget, registration, and logistical support for extended degree programs.

Question 2. Valid arguments could be made to support a stronger role for the academic college or the continuing education department. The decision to offer centralized or decentralized services is basically an institutional decision.

Question 3. The external degree should provide the same quality as on-campus degree programs. A coordinated effort between academic colleges and continuing education could best deliver high-quality extended degree programs.

Question 4. Comparable standards and quality for all degree programs. Programs designed and delivered to meet individual needs.

Question 5. The University of North Dakota's extended degree program in public administration has just completed its first year of operation. No evaluation has yet been conducted to assess student perception of the external degree.

South Dakota

Question 1. Extended degree programs are now offered through the college that offers the on-campus degree. Statewide coordination of continuing education would eliminate duplication of programs and improve the delivery of programs.

Question 2. The academic expertise is available within the college offering the degree. The fear of losing control of the program and student enrollment is a factor to take into consideration. South Dakota has several four-year institutions with limited enrollment, all competing for the same students.

Question 3. The optimum relationship between extended degree programs and other continuing education programs would be a statewide consortium to coordinate such things as instructors, facilities, and records. The state of South Dakota Extension Program coordinates all extension programs through an outreach extension center in each county.

Question 4. The role of the academic school is to provide instruction. The continuing education role is to deliver the services and coordinate the logistical problems.

Question 5. The extended degree programs in South Dakota receive on-campus credit. Continuing education programs receive off-campus credit. No real problems were expressed in this area.

Wyoming

Question 1. The University of Wyoming, in Laramie, offers extended degree programs in Cheyenne and in Casper. The Division of Adult Education and Community Services are not directly involved in the program. The programs are offered as regular campus programs and administered through the college offering the degree.

Question 2. In Wyoming the extended degree programs are, in reality, extended campus programs. Therefore, the college offering the degree controls the curriculum, faculty, and advisory role for the entire program.

Question 3. The optimum relationship varies for each college and state. The University of Wyoming offers a statewide continuing education program through university field coordinators located in key communities throughout the state.

Question 4. Continuing education should coordinate programs at the university or state level in cooperation with the college offering the degree. The extended degree program should offer the same quality programs as are offered on campus.

Question 5. At the University of Wyoming there is no difference between extended degree programs and other types of continuing education programs.

Utah

A variety of extended degree programs are available in Utah public and private institutions. Programs are offered on campus, off campus, and on military bases in the United States and around the world.

Question 1. University of Utah programs are not referred to as extended degree programs, although degree programs are offered off campus. The off-campus degree programs are offered through the college or academic department rather than through the division of continuing education.

Question 2. The Continuing Education Division has a traditional role of offering credit and noncredit classes of a general interest nature rather than the extended degree programs. One argument for administering extended degree programs through the college involved is administrative control and accountability.

Question 3. The University of Utah offers the same program off campus as on campus. The class schedule is modified to meet the needs of the off-campus student.

Question 4. The credit classes should carry the same standards and quality regardless of where the class is held.

Question 5. The University of Utah does not offer extended degree credit; students enrolled in extended degree programs receive the same degree, curriculum, and instruction as on-campus students.

Problems and Solutions

Problems

1. Academic approval of extended degree programs
2. Decreasing campus enrollment in small colleges
3. The cost of external degree programs is higher
4. Most universities have limited experience in external degree program operation
5. Fear of losing control of academic programs
6. Limited faculty to deliver extended degree programs
7. Difficulty in assessing the need for extended degree programs
8. Funding of external degree programs
9. How higher education can respond to community needs
10. Library or learning resource centers limited for extended degree students

Solutions

1. Start pilot programs on a limited basis to gain experience in extended degree programs
2. Establish policies and procedures to offer extended degrees on request
3. Develop a state or regional consortium to deliver extended degree programs
4. Seek funding through WICHE to research and develop models to implement extended degree programs
5. Develop staff training seminars on extended degree programs

The Quality Question--Achieving and Maintaining High Quality of Teaching Services and Student Performance

H. Victor Baldi, Jack McBride, and Kenneth O'Brien

Many persons have a particular concern about the quality of offerings and of student performance in any program that differs from the traditional on-campus, in-class instructional programs. The question of maintaining quality was addressed from three perspectives by the presenters in this session.

H. Victor Baldi
Assistant Executive Director
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

> Victor Baldi is responsible for coordination and administration of the accreditation activities of some 80 two-year institutions seeking membership status in the North Central Association. Previously, he held teaching and administrative positions with the University of Wisconsin and the University of Oriente in Venezuela.

"Extended degree program" is a broad rubric indeed: all sizes and shapes of ships sail under this flag. I believe that it is this diversity that makes quality control in extended degree programs such a difficult topic to address accurately. In the past, I have been impressed with the difficulties in making qualitative judgements for even the more familiar forms of higher learning. At least, so-called "traditional" institutions are relatively similar in matters of such things as organization, governance, academic policies, and curricular offerings. Generally, institutional evaluation has been greatly influenced by how closely the characteristics of an institution conform to commonly accepted notions of good practice in terms of institutional structures and processes. Remove these familiar frames of reference, however, and the problems of assessment stand out that much more clearly.

Because there is such a variety of extended degree programs, I want to establish a rough taxonomy to deal with them. I believe it is possible to categorize extended degree programs along a conventional/unconventional continuum in at least four key dimensions: (1) clientele to be served, (2) mode of program delivery, (3) academic governance, and (4) curriculum.

An advantage to approaching the topic from a conventional versus unconventional perspective is that it avoids the awkward term "nontraditional." Granted, there may be aspects of these programs that are the opposite of so-called conventional academic programs, but to suggest that extended degree programs "lack tradition" (i.e., are nontraditional) shows an unrefined appreciation for history. After all, the external degree program of the University of London dates from 1836, which should establish some claim to "tradition" for external degree programs everywhere.

Actually, many of the extended degree programs I have encountered are quite ordinary in terms of one or more of these dimensions. That is to say, the program might be quite conventional in terms of clientele, academic governance, and curriculum, but very unconventional in terms of the mode of delivery. This may help to explain why traditional academic standards may be functional and applicable at times in the evaluation of extended degree programs. But what happens when the extended degree program leans heavily toward the unconventional end of the continuum in all (or nearly all) of the four dimensions cited previously?

I want to stress that, although quality control for extended degree programs is likely to be influenced greatly by standards applicable to the prevailing norms, it need not take place solely in the context of those norms. One should expect that there will be numerous instances when extended degree programs will satisfy the criteria of traditional standards of quality. The point to be emphasized, however, is to accept this when it occurs but not to take this as a starting point. The proper starting point is to determine relevant indices of good practice by which extended degree programs ought to be judged.

What, then, are some important indices of good practice for extended degree programs that serve an unconventional clientele? How are students selected and admitted to the program? Traditional sorting and screening devices such as SAT scores, GRE scores, and grade-point averages generally appear less applicable and may be philosophically contradictory in those instances where the concept of open admissions is practiced in its most radical form. Nevertheless, such programs do have an obligation, it seems to me, to establish some appropriate mechanisms for selection and orientation of students that will prevent the open door from becoming a revolving door.

Most extended degree programs of which I am aware place extraordinary emphasis on self-paced learning and self-generated instruction. I remain unconvinced that these learning strategies are appropriate for all students and even less convinced that educators involved in programs serving so-called "new learners" have taken enough time to ensure that these persons can handle individualized learning. What I have seen too often is the leap-frog assumption that "having been failed by A (conventional programs), the answer is B (an extended degree program)." What is being argued here is not so terribly abstruse; it is that, with traditional criteria used for admissions removed, what criteria (both explicit and implicit) have been substituted? Also, what efforts have program developers made to ascertain the appropriateness of these criteria in light of programmatic objectives to be attained?

The integrity of the selection process is absolutely essential in any event, but perhaps even more so if the clientele is one that has been traditionally disenfranchised in the educational sense. Can persons responsible for program admissions select these students on a "high-risk/high-gain" basis and then maintain the quality standards by deselecting nonachievers? At what cost to the rhetoric of the program? At what cost to the individuals admitted to a program "especially suited to their needs"?

Can meaningful tests for effectiveness and efficiency be established for extended degree programs with an unconventional mode of delivery? I think that the most damaging general criticism I can advance is that noncampus-based instruction, theoretically designed to maximize resources, typically suffers from a lack of adequate educational resources. The learner in the extended degree programs I have encountered usually appears to have been isolated from a critical mass of fellow students, professionals with expertise, and concentration of learning resources.

Again, I do not believe that traditional standards need be employed to the detriment of innovative programming. Extended degree programs do need, however, to develop equally applicable quality standards to ensure that the delivery mode is not incompatible with programmatic objectives. Are resource faculty genuinely qualified to serve as learning facilitators for students, each of whose program is likely to be *sui genesis*? Who makes these judgements? What criteria serve as a basis? What constitutes a maximum load for a faculty member in this type of program? What opportunities does the program provide for a student to be exposed to (and interact with) a variety of persons with different competencies and perspectives? How do program developers ensure that appropriate learning resources are available in the extended degree setting?

If I had to isolate the greatest source of potential problems for effective quality control in extended degree programs with a highly unconventional mode of delivery, however, I would cite the inadequate separation between these three functions: (1) facilitation of learning, (2) assessment of learning, and (3) certification of competencies. In many of these programs, these three functions are handled by the same person or a small group of persons. However, the high degree of personal involvement between the learner and facilitator in an individualized learning situation probably argues against the facilitator assuming a key role in the evaluation and certification of the learner. Although the same argument in favor of separating the functions of instruction and evaluation is no less true for conventional programs, at least the learner typically is exposed to the judgments of several faculty members, probably from different departments and disciplines, during the individual's course of studies. In my opinion, a careful distribution of these functions represents a key element in the quality-control package for extended degree programs.

Academic governance is another key area in the maintenance of quality standards in any institution's programs. By "academic governance" I mean the sets of relationships established to provide for program accountability. Several questions that occur are, (1) Who establishes policies for the program? (2) Who monitors the implementation and execution of these policies? (3) Who serves in a "checks and balances" capacity? (4) Who controls the approval of instructors and counselors? and (5) Who controls the guidelines that influence the activities of these individuals? I believe that program accountability is enhanced when these points of control remain largely outside the primary group responsible for program delivery. I am less comfortable with unconventional governance arrangements in seemingly conventional institutions, for example, where the extended degree program is responsible directly to the president's office and is immune to the general academic policies and procedures of the institution. While I do not think such an institution's general admissions policies should be applied automatically to the extended degree program, I do think that there should be some responsible group within the institution to sanction the admissions policies employed in the extended degree program. Similarly, I do not think that the instructional personnel in the extended degree program should be restricted to only those who could qualify for a departmental appointment on the home campus. But I do think that there should be some responsible group within the institution to review the qualifications of these persons in the context of predetermined criteria. In the final analysis, I believe that the most productive approach to the matter of academic standards for programs exhibiting unconventional modes of governance is to test the face validity of these arrangements, and then pursue the question of effectiveness.

Finally, what of the extended degree program with a highly unconventional curriculum? It is in the nature of the curriculum that the crux of the quality control debate is found. Frequently, the first pledge of institutions or systems of higher education considering an external degree is that "it shall be of the same quality as our regular degree." Despite good intentions, I believe that it inadvertently misleads the general public (and more than a few of us in higher education). The promise of the same quality--or perhaps, more accurately, an equally comparable level of quality for the extended degree--is not necessarily a promise of a similar curriculum. Clearly, there exists a right to expect an equally demanding curriculum.

I identify three major problems that need to be resolved.

1. Developers of extended degree programs largely have neglected developing their own sets of credentialling symbols for these degrees. Instead, they have elected to use the nomenclature associated with conventional degree programs--B.A., M.A., Ph.D., and so forth. There are several obvious reasons for this practice, but I believe the chief reason is a realization that it is not the learning experience itself that has come to have value in the marketplace, it is the symbol of the experience (the degree). A Ph.D. sells, but a Doctorate of Individualized Learning would not. Nevertheless, I believe that the principle of truth in labeling deserves some recognition in this area.

2. The second major problem lies in the area of assessment. I have already mentioned the necessity of placing the responsibility for evaluation in the hands of an independent group not involved with the learning experiences of that particular student. Regardless of who conducts student evaluations, it is clear that there is a pressing need to develop increased sophistication in the assessment of experiential learning.

3. Traditional control of the curriculum has resided within the disciplines. The content of the individual courses within that curriculum was developed and taught by persons within a department belonging to the particular discipline. Now there are instances where curricula and courses are being developed outside the traditional departmental setting. There are examples where the curriculum for the individual is transacted on a totally individualized basis. I do not believe that these differences in approach to curricular theory are likely to be reconciled. But I do believe that the emerging forms will develop enough acceptance that they will come

to be valued in their own right.

Finally, I have four general observations relative to the topic of quality control for extended degree programs: (1) academic standards emerge from a general consensus as to what constitutes good practice; (2) programs that depart from common practice will be in an ambiguous situation until a new consensus emerges as to what constitutes good practice; (3) extended degree programs exhibit considerable diversity and frequently and simultaneously possess both conventional and unconventional dimensions; and (4) although traditional standards can serve in assessing conventional programs, some different questions must be asked if we are to measure the quality of programs that are unconventional in terms of dimensions such as those I have described.

Jack McBride
Executive Vice-President
University of Mid-America

Jack McBride is executive vice-president of the University of Mid-America, a five-state consortium, supported by the National Institute of Education and private foundations as a model of open learning course design and production. He is also executive director of the State University of Nebraska, the new statewide open learning adult education service developed as a pilot program of the federal government. In addition, Mr. McBride is general manager of the statewide Nebraska Educational Television Network, a field in which he has held many positions related to educational television.

From its inception, the University of Mid-America has found it necessary to pay close attention to the quality of its teaching and learning schema. This is because it is an operational experiment of some magnitude, because it is attempting to alter the educational status quo, and because it is striving to serve as a regional developmental model. We address the quality question on a daily basis from necessity, for the achievement and maintenance of a high-quality teaching-learning process. Service must be the primary objective of an external program if academic integrity is to be sustained and meaningful credit made available to the learner upon successful completion of the educational endeavor.

I want to address the quality question from the viewpoint of program developers and administrators who plan and produce educational outreach courses for teaching at a distance. Although the organization I represent does not itself deliver these courses, its success will, to a large extent, be measured by those postsecondary educational institutions employing our open learning courses in their developing nontraditional and extended degree programs. Use of UMA's courses necessitates faculty review and evaluation. This requires faculty involvement at a number of points. It also means faculty overseeing of all that UMA represents. Thus, my intent is to describe one serious and systematic attempt to build quality into the particular teaching and learning process we are employing, and to develop appropriate relationships between campus faculty and external programs.

UMA Background

A not-for-profit corporation, UMA is a consortium of seven state universities in five midwestern states. The presidents of Iowa and Iowa State Universities, Kansas and Kansas State Universities, and the Universities of Missouri, Nebraska, and South Dakota serve as the Board of Trustees. With principal subsidy for an extended period from the National Institute of Education and with consortial funding from other federal agencies and private foundations, UMA is a regional consortium and model with four objectives: (1) the design and development of mediated credit and noncredit courses for use off campus in teaching at-a-distance programs, (2) research into and evaluation of formal adult teaching and learning, (3) assistance with the planning and development of state open learning delivery mechanisms, and (4) dissemination of both course work and research products to all those interested.

UMA's target audience is the off-campus learner, the adult who is either unwilling or unable to take advantage of traditional educational opportunities. UMA has no campus, it grants no credit, it awards no external degree. Instead, UMA works with and through existing educational institutions of higher learning and their open learning delivery systems to see that teaching and learning take place. Three prime considerations motivate UMA: the improvement of educational access, the improvement of the quality of education, and the achievement of economies of scale. This is obviously a complex and demanding assignment--one that has no chance of success without considerable and direct support from a number of academicians and educational administrators.

Quality. We should also establish what we at UMA perceive to be quality in our programs. The precise definition of the term remains elusive because of the experimental nature of our undertaking. We have no clear precedents to follow, no preordained standards by which we can measure our accomplisments. But, as we understand it, quality for UMA has at least these identifiable aspects:

1. The quality of academic content of our courses and programs: UMA courses must be perceived of as at least being equal in quality to those courses taught on campus in the traditional manner.

2. The effectiveness of the teaching/learning process: The achievement levels of students, measured relative to students in other forms of postsecondary education, are an indicator of the relative quality of UMA courses and programs.

3. The quality of our undertakings in educational research and evaluation: As an experimental system, it is UMA's responsibility to measure and document its progress and to plan carefully each step of its way. We hope our research and evaluation efforts will be of great significance to postsecondary education.

Reactions to UMA. Though UMA has been in operation just 16 months, faculties, administrators, funding agencies, and students of American higher education are already reacting to this new learner-centered educational outreach program. They will continue to assess it, evaluate its potential, and examine its strengths and weaknesses. As might be expected with any innovation in education, there is a complete spectrum of reaction--from opposition and disdain, through apathy and disinterest, moderate attention, and pro forma lip-service, to genuine interest and enthusiastic support. As expected, we encounter a variety of concerns on the part of academicians over the quality of this educational outreach program. The fears include: watered-down and inferior teaching and learning; noninvolvement of faculty; television itself, for this medium usually connotes entertainment and not education; competition for the same student in a period of decreasing enrollments; fear of replacement; fear that the new open learning program will emulate certain earlier unsuccessful adult education and correspondence study programs; fear of a traditionally low completion rate for many off-campus courses; and, in general, fear of open learning as an unknown quantity. Some of these fears are well founded, others are not. But all of them present a problem in dealing with campus faculty.

How is UMA responding to these concerns? I will answer this question as the concerns relate to the achievement and maintenance of quality of teaching and learning in an off-campus context, focusing upon the faculty and their relationship to educational outreach. I will also examine the question of quality in terms of two important sets of UMA activities: the development of instructional materials and the delivery of those open learning materials to the off-campus adult.

UMA Curriculum, Course Development, and Evaluation

Attention to quality permeates the entire UMA course development process, starting with policies approved by the chief executive officers of the seven UMA-member institutions. These presidents, who make up the UMA Board of Trustees, are deeply committed to striving to develop course materials that pass every academic test, which they must or this regional model will not endure.

Curriculum. The heart of UMA organization--course development, curricular planning, research, evaluation, and delivery system planning--is presided over by a vice-president for academic affairs, a person of substantial academic training and experience. Assisting him is a group of professionals with varied and substantive academic backgrounds, brought together from throughout the United States.

Advising this staff is an academic structure especially created at the time of UMA's activation--an Academic Council composed of five senior faculty members and educational administrators from each of the seven member institutions, together with the delivery system coordinators from each institution. Selected by each member institution and approved by the trustees, this 42-person body has developed and continues to refine an open learning philosophy and curriculum goals posture for UMA. It assists with the development of curricular policy and recommends courses for future development.

Course Development. Each UMA course team has four core members: a formative evaluator, a professional media producer, an instructional designer, and a resident content specialist who is a faculty member on leave from his home institution, whether a UMA member of not. Each team is augmented by the appropriate video, audio, and print support personnel.

UMA courses under development are composed of a series of components, including (although not necessarily in every course) color television lessons, newspaper lessons, audio cassettes, workbooks and study guides, textual materials, and a set of tests and examinations prepared by testing and measurement specialists with the advice of faculty.

Each course team operates with the assistance of a Senior Content Advisory Panel, composed of senior and distinguished academicians from the UMA faculties and other institutions throughout the United States. For example, Professor Edwin Reischauer of Harvard chairs the Content Advisory Panel for a course in Japanese studies. Panel members are particularly involved in the initial course design phase, during which instructional objectives for courses and lessons are determined. They assist with review and evaluation at various stages throughout the course development. In certain cases, they develop topic papers for use in a course study guide. In other instances, faculty members are requested to serve on a course preplanning team that conceptualizes the proposed course and reviews the proposal before it is submitted to an external funding agency.

Evaluation. UMA is developing a special formative evaluation process to assist each course team. At regular intervals, the course evaluator subjects components in varying stages of design and production to sample audiences of adult learners selected according to a rigorous process. Data are rapidly collected so that, with quick turnaround, results can be fed to the course team for use in revision of the course materials.

Under the leadership of an educational technologist/designer who is trained in educational methodology and the theory of learning, the course team and its advisors articulate instructional objectives, both for the full course and for individual lessons, and proceed to develop the course according to the stated instructional design.

These procedures and decision-making structures are designed to enable the University of Mid-America to ensure quality in the selection, design, and production of the multimedia courses currently under development. But this is only one part of the UMA operation. UMA also sponsors and coordinates an open learning delivery system in each of its member states that should be considered on how effectively and efficiently it delivers instruction to the learner.

Delivery

Because UMA does not itself grant course credit, each open learning course is taken by the state delivery system coordinator to the appropriate academic department for evaluation: The faculty of that department control the award of credit. This holds true both for UMA-produced courses and for courses developed by educational institutions in other sections of the country. The faculty review and evaluation process is thus central to the question of quality. Faculty members approved by the department granting credit are selected for each open learning course. They coordinate the delivery of that course and are responsible for grading examinations.

Several UMA delivery systems employ an inward WATS line that is manned by a course faculty member, or a graduate student working under supervision of the academic department, to answer questions. These same individuals respond to questions by mail. The students also receive personal attention and tutoring from counselors at a network of area learning centers in each of the UMA states.

Other techniques are being tried as well, including a faculty circuit rider, who occasionally meets personally with his students at the learning centers, and at optional weekend seminars. Preliminary evaluation indicates that these personal contacts by faculty members and learning center counselors, together with the regularity of television presentations, can considerably reduce the attrition rate for independent study. A preliminary study of attrition rates undertaken by UMA researchers indicates that the system is working well.

In the early offerings of UMA courses in our Nebraska delivery system, 56 percent of those initially enrolled for credit completed the courses, compared to a national mean for correspondence programs of 55.4 percent. Further, the survey indicates that a large percentage of noncompleters in the UMA courses continued to take the course, although on a noncredit basis. The completion rate for those finally enrolled in the UMA courses for credit was an impressive 83 percent, compared to a mean of 63.9 percent for correspondence courses (based on a National University Extension Association formula counting completions per total enrollment minus cancellations).[1] And UMA courses also reach an important nonenrolled audience of informal learners who follow the television or newspaper components of the courses. Currently, we have no means of previsely measuring the size of this informal audience, but preliminary data indicate it numbers well into the thousands. If UMA course materials are of a quality to attract and retain a sizable informal audience, this represents a significant vote of confidence in the quality of UMA courses.

Operational Indicators of Quality

UMA is deliberately striving for a high level of faculty involvement and participation, in order to try to ensure the quality of both teaching and learning in this nontraditional educational mode. This is a complex, demanding, and costly assignment, and, although it is too early to tell, there are encouraging signs.

Any new educational development necessarily undergoes more scrutiny than that given its predecessors. We are well aware that, in a highly experimental program of this type, instructional materials must be of a quality better than equal to campus instruction, as these materials will be subjected to more severe testing and rigorous evaluation than campus instruction. This is especially true of the UMA program, because UMA courses are designed for lease by educational institutions in all sections of the country. This means that a number of academic departments will have the opportunity and obligation to evaluate course materials prior to awarding credit.

In UMA context, I believe that quality is more than a matter of level of academic performance, but that the term also refers to the relevance of program content to the adult learner's needs. Nebraska's open learning delivery system, the State University of Nebraska, has completed an analysis of the first 2,800 registrants for its courses. The Nebraska experience shows that the vast majority of these adult learners are actively functioning as homemakers and mothers or are otherwise employed. With little time for independent study, these adult learners, in order to give of their precious time and hard-earned money, want programs of instruction both appealing to them and relevant to their needs. UMA is finding that its instructional products are being judged by several audiences: peer academics, external funders, professional media persons, and, most important, the wide variety of adult learners themselves.

---

[1] UMA completion figures from UMA Final Report to the National Institute of Education, November 1975. Correspondence figures from Mathieson, David E. *Correspondence Study: A Summary Review of the Research and Development Literature*. Syracuse, N.Y.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education, 1971.

The basic nature of educational outreach programs, particularly of those employing mass communications, necessitates a rethinking of every aspect of the teaching/learning process. Unfortunately, we do not know as much as we should about the use of educational communications and the formal adult learning process--about the instructional roles and responsibilities of the several media and their relationships to each other. Although the nature of such outreach programs demands somewhat different approaches, the University of Mid-America believes that learning at a distance can effectively take place without any lessening of quality. Our experience to date confirms the findings of market and clientele studies that a currently unserved group of learners awaits these mediated courses, and that through mass communications components, thousands of additional television viewers and newspaper readers will learn as bonus noncredit participants.

UMA is an experiment, a vast and important one. The achievement and the maintenance of quality in both teaching services and student performance are critical. We are also well aware that no nontraditional program can succeed and endure without the involvement, participation, endorsement, and active support of the faculty. The stakes are high, as is our objective. UMA is continuously seeking additional and better ways of performing. Time will tell us how well we have succeeded.

Kenneth O'Brien
Associate Director
California Pstsecondary Education Commission

Kenneth O'Brien has served as associate director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (until 1974, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education) since 1971. He was president of Bloomfield College in New Jersey prior to his position in California. Dr. O'Brien has held teaching and administrative positions at a number of institutions during his professional career.

I strongly believe that the same criteria of quality for extended degree programs should apply as it does for the regular on-campus programs, particularly if they lead to a degree. It could be argued, however, that at present, we do not apply very adequate standards of quality to current on-campus offerings, so how can we translate this into ensuring quality for extended degree programs?

Everywhere traditional requirements are being replaced. Does this vitiate the quality of traditional programs? If so, what effect does this have on extended degree programs? I do not think we have found very good answers, and I am not at all sure that quality necessarily drops with the absence of traditional requirements. However, if I were to state that quality for extended degree programs must be the same as that for on-campus programs, I would increase my conservative stance by adding that the faculty must determine standards of quality. If they cannot do this satisfactorily, then they have abdicated one of their basic functions to others who are perhaps less competent to determine what ought to comprise degree programs to ensure their quality.

Second, a full rationale has to be developed for the kind of criteria that are involved in the development of any degree programs, so that those who oversee the approval of such programs, such as segmental offices, the Postsecondary Education Commission, or others, will clearly see the rationale and need for such programs. If a program does not have the same degree of quality as an on-campus program, we will not have fulfilled our obligation to the students to offer full-quality degrees off campus as well as on campus.

How, then, does the state enter into this to ensure that quality does exist in extended degree programs? Very carefully, I think. There are many ways in which the state can be involved legitimately. For example, the state traditionally has been involved in licensing or chartering institutions. This process generally rests on accreditation by voluntary associations, although it is being questioned in a number of states. Standards set by these associations supposedly ensure quality; however, they have also been charged with stifling innovation.

State licensing of the professions also has a direct impact on quality. For example, mandatory continuing professional educational requirements, which are in favor throughout the country, will have an impact on curricula both on campus and on extended degree programs far beyond that ever visualized by any postsecondary education institution. It has always been true that independent professional groups such as the National League for Nursing, the American Bar Association, and American Medical Association have developed curricula that schools cannot refuse to implement without losing their professional accreditation. Here there is a direct impact of professional associations working with the state licensing board to ensure specific curricula that may or may not be the highest quality curricula for students in degree programs. I have no simple solution because I think the state probably needs some assurance that degree programs that affect the public health, welfare, and safety or good are such that they will indeed do precisely that.

Again, the state, through agencies such as the one I represent, has the responsibility for coordinating extended degree programs. The question is, Does the state have the responsibility for examining the quality of these programs or merely for examining where they are and suggesting that they ought not to overduplicate? Can we ask ourselves, Does the proliferation of extended degree programs reduce quality or enhance it? Those who argue that it reduces quality do so on the basis that many programs will result in heavy competition for students, and that the best way to attract students is to develop an easily obtainable degree. Others argue that competition among programs will ensure that the better programs will endure and that the lesser quality programs will fade away. We believe that when state resources are involved, excessive duplication limits resources and, if there is any connection between money and quality, it also limits the quality.

Outside the areas of accreditation, chartering, licensing, and coordination, where else can the state move to become an effective partner in assuring quality in extended degree programs? Some alternatives, for purposes of discussion are:

1. A statewide accrediting association for extended degree programs. Such an agency could examine programs in the various public institutions to be sure that there are proper faculty and adequate educational and fiscal resources to launch the programs and prevent duplication.

2. Development of various indices with which to monitor the effectiveness of postsecondary education. For example, we are now developing a statewide information base for all postsecondary education. It is our intent to monitor this information to highlight certain items that seem to suggest additional study is needed to ensure that quality continues and increases. These items would include such things as unusual enrollment patterns, proliferation of certain kinds of courses, or the absence of other kinds of programs that may be significant.

3. An active state role in the approval of off-campus centers. Off-campus centers generally are created to accommodate those who normally cannot get to the campus or take advantage of regular on-campus programs. Thus, extended degree programs begin to be housed in facilities that very often become rather more permanent than they were intended in the first place. However, in the establishment of centers for extended degree programs, very often the support services are just not adequate to provide the same quality as is the case on campus. Therefore, the state agencies involved in the approval of these off-campus centers, whether at segmental

or state level, must ensure that the students--who come to these extended degree programs believing that they are as good as on-campus programs--will find that to be the case.

4. State determination that its scholarship and loan programs are not discriminatory against part-time students. Extended degree programs are sought after by older people and by younger people who do not have the time and resources necessary to go to school on campus. Very often student aid is not as available to them as it is to full-time on-campus students. I think that the state, through the resources that it uses for student financial aid, must develop policies so that extended degree and part-time students are not discriminated against and are given the necessary funding to fulfill their needs.

5. Development by the state of long-range longitudinal studies of the performance of students in extended degree programs. After these programs have been in progress for some time, it would be well for the segmental statewide offices, the institutions themselves, and a statewide research organization such as ours to undertake a comprehensive sampling of the students who have gone through the programs, with regard to their persistence, their ability to find jobs, and their general satisfaction with the program having to do with their own life goals. This is a complicated and long-range task, but I think it is a necessary one, in order to periodically review the quality of extended degree programs.

In sum, students ought not to be cheated by enrolling in extended degree programs without the assurance that these programs are as good and as respected as are on-campus degree programs. There has to be full transfer of credits and acceptance of these programs among institutions within the state or beyond. Second, the state must establish some mechanism whereby there are both criteria and resources for long-range evaluation of such programs. There must be resources made available by the state through its student financial aid programs for students in extended degree programs and for part-time students as a whole.

I have not suggested exact mechanisms by which quality judgments can be made because I am convinced that these mechanisms cannot be prescribed precisely. I think they have to vary from state to state and perhaps from program to program. Obviously, professional programs must be evaluated differently from general liberal arts programs, which in turn must be evaluated differently from vocational programs. A highly flexible system of evaluation must be set up that can accommodate these different degree programs.

The extended degree program is here to stay. It will continue to grow as an important means of handling education delivery services, and, like all other previous "innovations" in postsecondary education, it will become the conventional wisdom before long.

A Summary of the Full Group Discussion and Recommendations on Extended Degree Programs in the West

The dean of continuing education at California State University, Sacramento, Raymond J. Endres, was the leader for the session devoted to an open discussion by all conference participants. The session provided a forum for the discussion of future activities that would enable extended degree programs in the West to facilitate providing even better and more comprehensive services than they do now. During this and other discussion sessions, several areas of concern were identified. No priority rating was assigned, for it was felt that such a rating could be better accomplished through postconference communication. Therefore, the areas are discussed herein without any indication of their relative importance.

It should be noted that many of the concerns are shared by all institutions involved in extended degree programs. In those areas where specific needs vary for different kinds of institutions (public and private, two-year and four-year), conferees recommended that attention should be given to particular activities for specific types of institutions.

Communication among extended degree professionals in the West was emphasized by many participants as an area needing attention. Suggestions on ways of improving and/or developing communication included a newsletter, the creation of a network of extended degree program practitioners for communication and consultation, a future conference with focus on a specific issue, a WICHE clearinghouse/information collection and dissemination function, a series of one-day workshops concerned with specific topics for institutional teams, and model development for specific aspects of extended degree programs. Topics suggested by conference participants for workshops were administrative organization for extended degree programs, faculty- and staff-related issues, financing, learning environments for adults, state/federal actions and laws that affect extended degree programs, students, and student-support services. Some of these topics might also be suggested as the basis for research studies and papers. A related area that was discussed was the need for communication on the availability of instructional materials, including delivery media. The conferees urged exploration of ways to avoid unnecessary duplication of expense resulting from each institution developing materials for similar purposes.

The problem of selecting and recruiting the special kinds of faculty and staff, both regular and adjunct, was a concern of many conferees. Development of a faculty and personnel resource pool with information retrieval capabilities was suggested to help in identifying potential faculty. Faculty preparation, orientation, and career development were other areas of concern, as were faculty compensation and faculty involvement in curricular development, delivery, and evaluation of extended degree programs.

Several student-related concerns were identified by conference participants. These included:

1. Student needs assessment with attention to part-time students

and continuing education

2. Serving students in rural areas
3. The learning environment for adults
4. Credit assessment and validation
5. Student admission and selection criteria
6. A regional credit bank or repository with information on how institutions award credit
7. A regional open university
8. Regional counseling and information services for all adults in the West (perhaps a regional educational brokering of adult/continuing education/extended degree programs)
9. Cost of extended degree programs
10. Value of extended degree programs to students

Evaluation of extended degree programs was considered by the group to be an especially important topic. All conference participants recognized the need to provide and maintain quality programs for the student consumer. The unsolved problem appears to be how to measure the value of extended degree programs in a credible manner. The conferees felt that institutions need help in program evaluation, and WICHE was urged to provide assistance in this area.

In addition to the topics that focused on extended degree programs, there was discussion of areas that have importance for all postsecondary education. Specifically, the suggestion was made that the possibility for predicting future educational needs and alternate forms of responses to those needs be addressed. The essence of this idea is that educators should plan for change rather than merely react to it. For example, the effects on education by economic and societal changes should be prepared for in advance.

Conference participants were asked to forward their ideas regarding extended degree programs to WICHE so that future regional activities focusing on concerns in the field might be planned. In addition, the formation of an advisory group of extended degree practitioners to give advice and direction to WICHE was suggested. Finally, continued involvement and leadership by WICHE in the area of extended degree programs was urged by conference participants.

EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAMS IN THE WEST

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

July 11-14, 1976

PROGRAM TOPICS AND TIMES

SUNDAY, JULY 11

6:00 p.m.

Dinner and Opening Session: "Redefining Higher Education"

Session Leader: Donald MacIntyre
Academic Vice President
University of San Francisco

Presenter: Alex C. Sherriffs
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
The California State University and Colleges

8:30 p.m.

Reception and Get-Acquainted Time

MONDAY, JULY 12

8:30-9:45 a.m.

"Extended Degree Programs: The Big Issues, The Big Challenges"

Session Leader: Carvel W. Wood
Professor of Education
Oregon State University

Presenters: Leland L. Medsker
Director, Nontraditional Education Project
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Stewart Edelstein
Postgraduate Research Associate
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Janet Ruyle
Assistant Director
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

John R. Shea
Senior Fellow
Carnegie Policy Council on Higher Education

9:45-10:15 a.m. Coffee Break

10:15 a.m.-12:15 p.m.

"On the Firing Line"--Analysis of Selected Programs Operating in Varied Settings

Session Leader: Barbara H. Mickey
Associate Vice President of University and
Dean of Academic Development and Evaluation
University of Northern Colorado

Presenters: Donald Clague
Vice President-Academic Affairs
La Verne College

(Continued on next page)

(MONDAY, JULY 12--cont.)

(Presenters--cont.)

George E. McCabe
Director
The Consortium of The California State University and Colleges

Barbara H. Mickey

Donald M. Schliesman
Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Central Washington State College

Barry G. Schuler
President
North Idaho College

12:15 p.m. Luncheon

1:30-3:15 p.m.

"Serving People: Discovering Needs, Meeting Needs"

Session Leader and Presenter:
Nancy Tapper
President
Peralta College for Non-Traditional Study

3:15-4:30 p.m. Coffee Break

3:45-5:15 p.m.

"The State Responsibility in Extended Degree Programs"

Session Leader:
Glenn Starlin
Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Resources
University of Oregon

Presenters:
Patrick M. Callan
Executive Coordinator
Washington State Council for Postsecondary Education
WICHE Commissioner

Donald J. Nolan
Director
New York Regents External Degree Program

EVENING OPEN

TUESDAY, JULY 13

8:30-10:00 a.m.

"Financing Extended Degree Programs"

Session Leader:
Joseph Petta
Dean of Continuing Education
University of Southern Colorado

Presenters:
Richard Gustafson
State Representative, Oregon

George J. Nolfi, Jr.
President
University Consultants, Inc.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

10:00-10:30 a.m. Coffee Break

10:30-11:45 a.m.

Discussion Groups - Topics to be Selected by Participants

11:45 a.m. Luncheon

1:15-2:30 p.m.

"Extended Degree Programs--Part of a Larger Picture of Continuing Education"

Session Leader: Joseph W. Chatburn
Dean of Continuing Education
Eastern Washington State College

Presenters: Ralph D. Mills
State University Dean of Continuing Education
The California State University and Colleges

Charles Steensland, Program Coordinator
Region VIII, Human Resources Management Program
University of Utah

2:30-3:00 p.m. Coffee Break

3:00-4:30 p.m.

Full Group Discussion and Recommendations On Extended Degree Programs in the West--
Possibilities For:
--Information Exchange
--Cooperative Efforts
--Further Development
--A WICHE Role

Session Leader: Raymond J. Endres
Dean of Continuing Education
California State University, Sacramento

WEDNESDAY, JULY 14

8:30-10:30 a.m.

"The Quality Question"--Achieving and Maintaining High Quality of Teaching Services and Student Performance"

Session Leader: Reuben W. Smith
Dean of the Graduate School
University of the Pacific

Presenters: H. Victor Baldi
Assistant Executive Director
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

Jack McBride
Executive Vice President
University of Mid-America

Kenneth O'Brien
Associate Director
California Postsecondary Education Commission

10:30-11:00 a.m. Concluding Session

11:00 a.m. Luncheon

Conference Roster

Michael Adams
Western Rural Development Center
Extension Hall 307
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331

503/754-3621

Jan Alford
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

916/445-7933

Gordon C. Atkins
A.N. Whitehead College
University of Redlands
Redlands, CA 92373

714/792-8961

Ralph V. Backman
Westminster College
1840 South 1300 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84105

801/484-7651 x 295 or
801/485-1231

H. Victor Baldi
Assistant Executive Director
Commission on Institutions of
Higher Education
North Central Association
of Colleges and Schools
P.O. Box 2276
Boulder, CO 80302

Carolyn L. Ball
Program in Social Ecology
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, CA 92717

Milton T. Bard
Cogswell College
600 Stockton Street
San Francisco, CA 94108

Boyd M. Bolvin
Bellevue Community College
3000 145 Place, S.E.
Bellevue, WA 98007

206/641-2255

Anthony D. Branch
College of Special Programs
Golden Gate University
536 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

415/391-7800

Seth Brunner
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

415/843-2177

Kevin P. Bunnell
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder, CO 80302

303/492-6630

Susan S. Burcaw
President's Office
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83843

208/885-6365

Patrick M. Callan
Executive Coordinator
Washington State Council for
Postsecondary Education
WICHE Commissioner
908 East Fifth Street
Olympia, WA 98504

206/753-3241

Gordon R. Cavana
John F. Kennedy University
12 Altarinda Road
Orinda, CA 94563

Joe W. Chatburn
Eastern Washington State College
Cheney, WA 99004
509/359-2201

Donald Clague
La Verne College
1950 Third Street
La Verne, CA 91750
714/593-3511 x 220

Robert Clifton
Metropolitan State College
250 West 14th Avenue
Denver, CO 80204
303/892-2560

Lawrence A. Clinger
San Diego State University
College of Extended Studies
San Diego, CA 92182
714/286-5147

Nancy Conrath
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/445-7933

Taun Cosentino
University of California,
San Francisco
School of Nursing
Third and Parnassus
San Francisco, CA 94143
415/666-1107

Alvin B. Danielson
Washington State Community College
District 17
North 2000 Greene Street
Spokane, WA 99207
509/456-6141

Noreen Dowling
University of California, Davis
376 Mark Hall
Division of Extended Learning
Davis, CA 95616
916/752-2820

Robert Duncan
U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
Federal Office Building
1961 Stout Street
Denver, CO 80202

Nancy A. Dyar
St. Mary's College
Experimental & Extended Education
P.O. Box 397
Moraga, CA 94575

Stewart Edelstein
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
4603 Tolman Hall
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720
415/642-7509

Raymond Endres
California State University,
Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95819
916/454-6101

Alice Erskine
San Francisco Art Institute
800 Chestnut Street
San Francisco, CA 94133
415/771-7020

Glen Fahs
Director of Continuing Education
Dominican College
San Rafael, CA 94901
415/457-4440

Hartmut Fischer
Office of Continuing Education
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94117

Stewart Fliege
Pepperdine University
8035 South Vermont
Los Angeles, CA 90044

213/971-7627

Betty Furuta
University of California,
San Francisco
School of Nursing
Third and Parnassus
San Francisco, CA 94143

415/666-1107

Russell Garth
3424 South Stafford Street
Arlington, VA 22206

202/245-9806

Barbara Gfeller
Coordinator of External Degree
Program
Marylhurst Education Center
Marylhurst, OR 97036

503/636-8141 x 22

Lyle E. Gibson
California State College,
Dominguez Hills
1000 Victoria Street
Dominguez Hills, CA 90747

213/532-4300 x 392

Mike Gilson
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

916/445-7933

Oscar Goodman
Consultant
Institute for Professional
Development
696 Trimble Road
San Jose, CA 95131

408/262-8500

Tim Grieder
Colorado Commission on Higher
Education
1550 Lincoln
Denver, CO 80203

303/892-2723

Victor S. Griffiths
Loma Linda University
3800 Pierce Street
Riverside, CA 92505

714/785-2241

Rick Gustafson
State Representative
State of Oregon
7833 S.E. 104th Avenue
Portland, OR 97266

503/229-4910

Ami Gusman
1725 LeRoy Avenue, #2
Berkeley, CA 94709

William B. Hackett
John F. Kennedy University
12 Altarinda Road
Orinda, CA 94563

Bill Haldeman
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

916/445-7933

Sharon Hoffman
California State University,
Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032

213/224-3176

John L. Houk
California State University,
Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032

213/224-3305

James Irany
Anchorage Community College
2533 Providence Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99504

907/279-6622 x 515

Andrew Jameson
Assistant Vice Chancellor
University of California, Berkeley
200 California Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720

415/642-7118

Melvin Jarrett
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

916/445-7933

Bill Jensen
Boise State University
1910 University Boulevard
Boise, ID 83725

208/385-3294

Pascal Kaplan
John F. Kennedy University
12 Altarinda Road
Orinda, CA 94563

Eleanore Kenny
Council for Postsecondary
Education
908 East Fifth
Olympia, WA 98504

206/753-1220

Ferd Kiesel
Education Consultant
Center for Continuing Education
P.O. Box 13032
Sacramento, CA 95813

916/929-8733

Denis J. Kigin
Arizona State University
University Extension
Tempe, AZ 85281

F.P. Kilpatrick
Nova University
College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314

305/486-6600

Eugene H. Kopp
West Coast University
Los Angeles, CA 90020

213/487-4433

Vernon A. Lestrud
Idaho State University
Campus Box 8050
Pocatello, ID 83209

208/236-3470

Wayne J. Lott
Brigham Young University
Department of Special Degrees
HRCB 222
Provo, UT 84602

801/374-1211 x 4351

Donald J. MacIntyre
University of San Francisco
Golden Gate and Parker Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94117

Jim Manolis
La Verne College
1950 Third Street
La Verne, CA 91750

Harold W. Martindale
A.N. Whitehead College
University of Redlands
Redlands, CA 92373

714/793-2121 x 225

Jack G. McBride
University of Mid-America
P.O. Box 82006
Lincoln, NB 68501

402/467-3671

George E. McCabe
Director
California State University
and Colleges
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802

213/590-5696

Leland Medsker
Director
Nontraditional Education Project
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
4603 Tolman Hall
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720

415/642-5769

Barbara H. Mickey
University of Northern Colorado
Frasier 101
Greeley, CO 80639

303/351-2156

Ralph D. Mills
California State University
and Colleges
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802

213/590-5691

Barbara A. Mitchell
Oregon Educational Coordinating
Commission
4263 Commercial Street, S.E.
Salem, OR 97310

503/378-3921

C. Theodore Molen, Jr.
American College Testing Program
2201 North Dodge Street
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52240

319/356-3739

Larry Morrill
Center for Continuing Education
P.O. Box 13032
Sacramento, CA 95813

916/929-8733

Paul F. Motzkus
Dean, Field Studies Sector
La Verne College
1950 Third Street
La Verne, CA 91750

Donald J. Nolan
Director
New York Regents External Degree
Program
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12230

518/474-8299

George J. Nolfi, Jr.
President
University Consultants, Inc.
45 Hancock Street
Cambridge, MA 02139

Kenneth O'Brien
Associate Director
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

916/445-7933

Jesse U. Overall
California State College
1000 East Victoria Street
Dominguez Hills, CA 90747

Richard E. Peterson
Educational Testing Service
1947 Center Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

415/849-0950

Joseph Petta
Dean of Continuing Education
University of Southern Colorado
2200 Bonforte Boulevard
Pueblo, CO 81001

303/549-0123
Ent Air Force Base--303/591-4940

L.R. Pierson
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Jackie Powers
La Verne College
1950 Third Street
La Verne, CA 91750

714/593-3511 x 226

Vera M. Robinson
Coordinator of Continuing
Education
School of Nursing
California State University,
Fullerton
24892 Cavanaugh Road
El Toro, CA 92630

Kate Rodgers
San Jose State University
Office of Continuing Education-
External Degrees
San Jose, CA 95192

408/277-2214

Janet Ruyle
Assistant Director
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
4603 Tolman Hall
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720

415/642-0573

Ben Sanders
University of Oregon
Hendricks Hall
Eugene, OR 97403

503/686-3807

Donald M. Schliesman
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, WA 98926

509/963-1403

Barry G. Schuler
President
North Idaho College
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814

208/667-7422

Craig Seaton
California Postsecondary
Education Commission
1020 12th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

916/445-7933

John R. Shea
Senior Fellow
Carnegie Policy Council
on Higher Education
2150 Shattuck Avenue, 10th Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704

415/849-4474

Alex C. Sherriffs
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
California State University
and Colleges
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802

213/590-5708

Robert O. Singer
Center for Non-Traditional
and Outreach Education
University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, CO 80639

303/351-2891

Reuben W. Smith
University of the Pacific
Stockton, CA 95211

209/946-2261

John G. Sperling
Institute for Professional
Development
696 Trimble Road
San Jose, CA 95131

408/262-8500

Glenn Starlin
Vice Provost for Academic Planning
and Resources
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

503/686-3081

Charles A. Steensland
Region VIII--Model Educational
Program
Human Resources Institute
University of Utah
2634 South Field Street
Lakewood, CO 80227

303/988-3534

Richard M. Straw
California State University,
Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032

213/224-2261

Nancy Tapper
President
Peralta College for
Non-Traditional Study
2020 Milvia Street
Berkeley, CA 94704

415/841-8431

Milton W. Thorn
Mt. San Antonio College
1100 North Grand Avenue
Walnut, CA 91789

714/598-2811 x 316

Sister Alice Tobriner, Ph.D.
Chairman
Education Department
Holy Names College
3500 Mountain Boulevard
Oakland, CA 94619

415/436-1022

Donald M. Warren
Academic Dean
Walla Walla College
College Place, WA 99324

509/527-2431

Carmen R. Westwick
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder, CO 80302

303/492-6104

Glenn R. Wilde
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322

801/752-4100 x 7375

Philip S. Wilder, Jr.
California State College, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy.
Bakersfield, CA 93309

805/833-2155

Carvel Wood
School of Education
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331

503/754-3738

Conference Staff:

Denise Chavez y Garcia
Secretary
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder, CO 80302

303/492-6676

Lilla E. Engdahl
Staff Associate
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder, CO 80302

303/492-6675

Thomas M. Shay
Senior Staff Associate
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder, CO 80302

303/492-6659

NOTE: Names of persons attending only one or two sessions and who did not register are not listed.

Publications Related to Extended Degree Programs

American Council on Education. Summary of Findings and Recommendations. *Financing Part-time Students: The New Majority in Postsecondary Education*. Washington, D.C.: ACE, 1974.

_______. *A Guide to Educational Programs in Non-collegiate Organizations*, a guide prepared by the American Council on Education and the New York Education Department. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1976.

Anderberg, G.T. "Continuing Education for a Scrap of Paper?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, vol. 12, no. 7, April 12, 1976.

Auerbach, Diane. "How to Get a College Degree without Really Trying." *College Press Service*, no. 45, March 22, 1976.

Bailey, Stephen K. "Flexible Time-Space Program: A Plea for Caution." In *The Expanded Campus*, edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Baskin, Samuel, ed. *New Directions for Institutional Research--Organizing Non-traditional Study*, vol. 1, no. 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Base, winter 1974.

Bender, Louis E. *Danger: Will External Degrees Reincarnate Bogus Degree Mills? A Challenge to State and National Agencies*. Tallahassee: Department of Higher Education, Florida State University, Center for State and Regional Leadership, July 1972.

Benoit, Richard P. "Alternative Programs for Higher Education: External and Special Degrees." *Intellect*, vol. 101, April 1973.

Blaze, Wayne, Hertzberg, Bill, Krantz, Roy, and Lehrke, Al. *Guide to Alternative Colleges and Universities*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1974.

Bowen, Howard. "Financing the External Degree." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 44, no. 6, June 1973.

Brooks, Jean S. *Cracking the Structure*. Dallas, Tex.: Dallas Public Library, 1974.

Cavert, C. Edward, comp. *Designing Diversity '75: Conference Proceedings, Second National Conference on Open Learning and Non-Traditional Study*. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Mid-America, 1975.

Central Michigan University. *University Without Walls: Honolulu Model Cities*, Mount Pleasant, Mich.: Central Michigan University, ED 108 308, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1974.

Chickering, Arthur W. "Assessing Students and Programs--A New Ball Game." *New Directions for Institutional Research--Organizing Non-traditional Study*, vol. 1, no. 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, winter 1974.

College Entrance Examination Board. "CLEP General Examinations in American Colleges and Universities." Princeton, N.J.: College Board Publications, 1976.

Commission on Non-traditional Study. *Diversity by Design*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Consortium of the California State University and Colleges. *The 1000-Mile Campus, Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog*. Los Angeles: CCSUC, spring 1975.

______. *Report of Institutional Self-Study Prepared for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges*. Los Angeles: CCSUC, January 1976.

Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. "External Degrees--Foreign and Domestic." *Communicator*, vol. 8, no. 8, April-May 1976.

Cross, K. Patricia. "The External Degree: Introduction." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 44, no. 6, June 1973.

Cross, K. Patricia, and others, eds. *Planning Non-traditional Programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Cross, Wilbur. *The Weekend Educational Source Book*. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

DeMott, Benjamin. "'Adult Ed'--The Ultimate Goal." *Saturday Review*, September 20, 1975.

Donavan, Carl C., Kenny, Eleanor, and Randall, Michael E. *External Education Program Options Available in Washington*. A report to the legislature in response to Senate Floor Resolution 1974-218. Olympia, Wash.: State of Washington Council on Higher Education, January 1975.

Education Commission of the States. *Model State Legislation, Report No. 39*. Denver, Colo.: ECS, 1973.

Erickson, Stanford C. "The Extended Classroom." *Memo to the Faculty*, no. 56, September 1975.

Fletcher, Marjorie A., ed. "The Open University, The External Degree and Non-traditional Study, A Selected Annotated Bibliography." Bryn Mawr, Pa.: American College of Life Underwriters, February 1972.

Fort Wright College. "Special Report to Northwestern Association of Secondary and Higher Schools by Fort Wright College Concerning Non-traditional Degree Programs." Spokane, Wash.: Fort Wright College, 1975. Mimeographed.

Gage, Gene, G. "The Nordic Example." *Saturday Review*, September 20, 1975.

Gartner, Alan, and Sunderland, Stephen C. "Where Might It All Be Going?" *New Directions for Institutional Research--Organizing Non-traditional Study*, vol. 1, no. 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, winter 1974.

Gelber, Mark. "Initiating and Implementing a Non-traditional Program." *New Directions for Institutional Research--Organizing Non-traditional Study*, vol. 1, no. 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, winter 1974.

Gephart, William J., Soretsky, Gary, and Bost, David. "How Potential Employers Value Components of Traditional and External Doctorates." *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 56, no. 6, February 1975.

Gibbs, O.B., and Lee, Herman C. "Colleges Without Walls: The Status of Non-traditional Learning in California Community Colleges." *College and University*, spring 1974.

Graham, Robert H. "The Walden University External Doctorate." *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 57, no. 7, March 1976.

Granat, Richard S. *State Regulations of External Degree Programs*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, ED 107 192, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1975.

Green, Madeleine F., and Sullivan, John J. "Credit for Non-collegiate Learning." *Educational Record*, vol. 56, no. 4, fall 1975.

Gould, S.B., and Cross, K. Patricia, eds. *Explorations in Non-traditional Study*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Haag, Carl H. "Credit by Examination Comes of Age." *Findings*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1975.

Hartnett, R.T. "Non-traditional study: An Overview." In *Explorations in Non-traditional Study*, edited by S.B. Gould and K. Patricia Cross. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Hartnett, Rodney T., Clark, Mary Jo, Feldmesser, Robert A., Gieber, Margaret L., and Soss, Neil M. *The British Open University*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1974.

Hechinger, Fred M. "Education's New Majority." *Saturday Review*, September 20, 1975.

Hefferlin, J.L. "Avoiding Cut Rate Credits and Discount Degrees." In *Planning Non-traditional Programs*, edited by K. Patricia Cross and others. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Hodgkinson, Harold. "Technology and Education." In *Designing Diversity '75*, edited by C. Edward Cavert. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Mid-America, 1975.

Houle, Cyril O. The External Degree. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

_______. "The Potential Audience for the External Degree." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 44, no. 6, June 1973.

_______. "The Public Library's Role in Non-traditional Study." Commissioned Papers Project, Teachers College, No. 6. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1974.

Howard, Toni A. "Reentry Programs." Meeting Women's New Educational Needs, New Directions for Higher Education, vol. 3, no. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, autumn 1975.

Johnson, Jeffrey N. University of Minnesota Faculty Participation in the University Without Walls. Minneapolis: University Without Walls, ED 095 733, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1974.

Joiner, Robert M., ed. "Non-degree Education for 394,683 Participants Reported." The System Summary. Atlanta: A publication of the University System of Georgia, vol. 12, no. 3, March 1976.

Kempfer, Homer. "Accrediting Continuing Education." Adult Leadership, vol. 23, no. 11, May 1975.

Knowles, Malcolm. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. Houston, Tex.: Gulf Pub. Co., 1973.

_______. Self Directed Learning: A Guide for Learners and Teachers. New York: Associated Press, 1975.

Lynton, Ernest. "Distinctions among Key Programs." New Directions for Institutional Research, vol. 1, no. 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Maeroff, Gene I. "From Mel Brooks to Medicine 1975." Saturday Review, September 20, 1975.

McConnell, T.R., Berdahl, Robert O., and Fay, Margaret A. From Elite to Mass to Universal Higher Education: The British and American Transformation. Berkeley, Calif.: 1973.

Medsker, Leland, Edelstein, Stewart, Kreplin, Hannah, Ruyle, Janet, and Shea, John. Extending Opportunities for a College Degree: Practices, Problems, and Potentials. Berkeley, Calif.: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1975.

Meeth, L. Richard. Government Funding Policies and Nontraditional Programs. Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.: Postsecondary Education Convening Authority, June 1975.

Meinert, Charles W. "Time Shortened Degrees." ERIC/HE Research Report No. 8. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1974.

Mickey, Barbara. "Designing the External Degree Program." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 44, no. 6, June 1973.

Miller, Myrna R., and Sterling, Albert M. "An Old-Fashioned New Trend: Evaluation at Empire State College." *Educational Horizons*, vol. 52, no. 4, summer 1974.

Mitchell, Donald P. "Let's Get the Record Straight: A Case for Nova University's External Doctorate in Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 55, no. 6, February 1974.

Moreland, Richard B. "On Growing Grapes in Greenland." *Phi Delta Kappan*, col. 56, no. 6, February 1975.

Morris, Roger. "Keep the Independent Student Independent." *American Libraries*, July-August 1973.

National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education. "Adult Part-Time Students: The Met and Unmet Needs." In *Equity of Access: Continuing Education and the Part-Time Student*, 9th Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: NACECE, March 31, 1975.

Nolfi, George J., and Nelson, Valerie I. *Strengthening the Alternative Postsecondary Education System: Continuing and Part-Time Study in Massachusetts*. Cambridge, Mass.: University Consultants, Inc., 1973. Two volumes: vol. 1, Summary Report and Recommendations, 160 pp.; vol. 2, Technical Report, 935 pp.

O'Neill, Robert M. *Learning-centered Education*. ED 104 244, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1975.

Pearson, Betty D. "Baccalaureate Degree Extended." *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, vol. 4, no. 3, May-June 1973.

Perlman, Daniel H. "External Degree Programs: Alternative Delivery Systems for Higher Education." *Liberal Education*, vol. 61, no. 3, October 1975.

Peterson, Richard E., and others. *Postsecondary Alternatives to Meet the Educational Needs of California's Adults*, Flexibility Study for California Legislature. Sacramento: California Legislature, September 1975.

Phelps, M. Overton, and Swann, Clare C. "Credit Prior to Enrollment--Computer Reporting on Exemptions and Advanced Placement Credit." *Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers*, vol. 50, no. 3, spring 1975.

Radloff, Barbara, ed. "There's More Than One Way to Earn a College Degree." *Carnegie Quarterly*, vol. 23, no.4, fall 1975.

Richards, Berry. *Information Systems for Non-traditional Study: The State-of-the-Art*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, ED 093281, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1974.

Russell, Donavan. "What Adults Want in Continuing Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 56, no. 6, February 1975.

Troutt, Roy. *Special Degree Programs for Adults, Exploring Non-traditional Degree Programs in Higher Education*, ACT Special Report Four. Iowa City, Ia.: American College Testing Program, 1971.

Tunstall, Jeremy. *The Open University Opens*. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1974.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Pollution in Higher Education, Efforts of the U.S. Office of Education in Relation to Degree Mills*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Postsecondary Education, Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility Staff, 1974.

Valley, John R. "External Degree Programs." In *Explorations in Non-traditional Study*, edited by S.B. Gould and K. Patricia Cross. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

_______. *Increasing the Options: Recent Developments in College and University Degree Programs*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

_______. "The External Degree: Recent Developments." *Findings*, vol. 1, no. 3, 1974.

Vickers, Donn F. "The Learning Consultant: A Response to the External Degree Learner." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 44, no. 6, June 1973.

Warren, Jonathan R. "External Degrees: Coping with the Problems of Credit." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 44, no. 6, June 1973.

Washington Council on Higher Education. *Exploring the External Degree*. Olympia, Wash.: ED 095 787, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 1973.

Watson, Goodwin. "Origins, Intent, and Current Developments." *New Directions for Educational Research--Organizing Non-traditional Study*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, vol. 1, no. 4, winter 1974.

Wishnoff, Robert. "Student Personnel Services in the University Without Walls." *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, vol. 53, no. 7, March 1975.

Zelan, Joseph, and Gardner, David P. "Alternatives in Higher Education--Who Wants What?" *Higher Education*, Vol. 4. Amsterdam: Elsevier Scientific Pub. Co., 1975.

010300000045000:
2C:1176:TG:WICHE:2B139